TREATISES
Concerning the
Divine Light,

THE FIRST,

Being an Answer to a Letter of a Learned Quaker, which he is pleased to call, *A Just Reprehension to* John Norris *for his Unjust Reflections on the Quakers, in his Book Entituled,* Reflections upon the Conduct of Human Life, *&c.*

THE SECOND,

Being a Discourse concerning the Grossness of the Quakers Notion of the *Light within,* with their Confusion and Inconsistency in Explaining it.

By *JOHN NORRIS,* M. A. Rector of *Bemerton* near *Sarum,* and late Fellow of *All-Souls* College in *Oxford.*

LONDON,
Printed for *Sam. Manship* at the *Black Bull* in *Cornhil,* near the *Royal Exchange,* 1692.

Licensed,

April 15.
1692.

ADVERTISEMENT TO THE READER.

THo I have not professedly undertaken in the Two following Treatises to give an express and full Account of the Divine Light, but only so far as I have occasion to do it in dealing with my Adversary, yet (if my Judgment may be taken concerning my own Work,) I think that even this Occasional Account *that occurs up and down in these Papers, may be so considerable as to give them a fair Right to the Title of* Treatises concerning

the Divine Light. *And tho the direct and professed business of the former of these Treatises be only a Private and Personal Ingagement between me and my Opposer, yet that it has been the occasion of my delivering many great and considerable things, as well Absolutely as Relatively consider'd, and such as if read carefully and judiciously, and with a thoroughly* Awaken'd *Attention, may contribute very much to the clearing of many useful Truths, and to the Improvement of the Reader in several curious Points of Speculation.*

An

An Answer *to a Letter of a Learned Quaker*, *which he calls*, A just Reprehension to *John Norris* of *Newton St. Loe*, for his unjust Reflection on the Quakers, in his Book Entituled, *Reflections upon the Conduct of Human Life*, &c.

By the Author of those Reflections.

THO I do not think it any great piece of Ignorance or Defect of Learning, not to be rightly acquainted with the Quaker's Principles, which if I knew them never so well, would add but little either to my Knowledge, or to my Opinion of it; yet I am withal so sensible of that Right, which even the meanest Persons

and Parties have to Juſtice and Fair Dealing, that I think I ſhould not be able to juſtifie my *miſrepreſenting* thoſe Principles, of which I might be very excuſably *Ignorant*.

And ſince this is the thing laid to my Charge, and that with a great deal of Paſſion and angry Reſentment, not to ſay Rudeneſs and Incivility, I think I may be allow'd to be ſo far concerned at the *Indictment*, as to endeavour to acquit my ſelf of it; not ſo much for the Honour of my *Judgment* (which I do not conceive at preſent to lie much at ſtake) as for the Juſtification of my *Sincerity*: Which tho I ſo peculiarly value, that I might be allowed to be a little warm in the Vindication of it, eſpecially coming after ſuch a provoking and affronting Adverſary, yet I hope I ſhall be able ſo to temper my Spirit and govern my Pen, that the *Defence* ſhall not be near ſo paſſionate as the *Charge*.

I confeſs indeed, I did not expect any great Civility of Addreſs from a Man of this ſullen Tribe, whoſe viſible Mark and Character is *Ruſticity*, and who are generally at as great Defiance with

with all Courtlineſs of *Style*, as of *Behaviour*. But yet I thought that the *Gentleman* and the *Scholar* (for ſuch it ſeems is the Quality of my Adverſary) might ſo far ballance and over-rule the *Quaker*, as to contain him within the Limits of Ordinary Decency, and keep him on this ſide Rudeneſs and Scurrility. To be blunt and down-right is one thing, but to be rude and abuſive is another. And however I might expect the former from him, and excuſe in him as a *Quaker*, yet of the latter I thought he would not be guilty as a *Gentleman*. Indeed the leaſt that I could expect from a Perſon of Mr. *Vickris* his Education and Quality, was, that he would not be *uncivil*, eſpecially in his firſt Onſet, and writing to a Perſon that was a Stranger to him; and who, tho he does not look upon himſelf to be ſo great as to be above Contradiction, may yet juſtly think himſelf conſiderable enough to expect and deſerve fair and civil Language. But in ſtead of this he falls foul upon me, after ſuch a rude, violent and paſſionate manner, as is below the Breeding even of a *Water-man*, and ſuch as a Man of any Temper would be aſhamed to be guilty of, even in the ſudden Heats of common Diſcourſe.

Which may tempt ſome unlucky Fancies to imagin, that he has exchang'd his *Cold* quaking Fit for an *Hot* one, and that the *Light* within is turn'd into a *Flame*.

I cannot in Juſtice deny, but that for a Man of his Way, my Adverſary is pretty conſiderable for his Senſe and Learning, (notwithſtanding that he endeavours to repreſent me as a Dunce and Blockhead as well as a Knave) and I believe he would have ſhewn more of each, and with better Advantage, if the Violence of his Paſſion had not diſturb'd the Clearneſs and Order of his Thoughts, and put him often out of his Guard. For Paſſion is the great Contrariety to Reaſon, and will draw a Cloud over the brighteſt Mind. The quiet and ſedate Soul is moſt fit for the Contemplation of Truth, as the calmeſt Weather is commonly the moſt ſerene. If *Love* be blind, *Anger* I'm ſure is much more ſo; and there is this remarkable difference between the Wars of the *Pen* and thoſe of the *Sword*, that tho the Soldier may fight to moſt Advantage in *Hot* Blood, the Diſputant will reaſon beſt in *Cold*.

But

But leſt I ſhould appear guilty of a falſe Charge in this reſpect, as he ſays I am in ſome others, and be thought to miſrepreſent the *Temper* and Behaviour of my Adverſary, as he ſays I do his *Principles*, I think it neceſſary for my own Security, to give the Reader ſome Account of the Paſſion, Rudeneſs and Abuſiveneſs of this Aggreſſor, before I proceed to conſider the Argument of his Paper.

And here (to paſs by the Roughneſs and the Magiſterial Ayre of the Title Page, where at firſt Dash he aſſumes the Office of a Cenſor, and undertakes to *Reprehend*, taxing me with no leſs than falſe *Repreſentation*, *Confuſion* and *Self-Contradiction*, which I think might be more properly left to the Judgment of the Reader, or bring up the Arrear, than be placed in the Front of the Book) I appeal for the Truth of this Charge to the following Paſſages.

When firſt (ſays he, *pag.* 3.) *I peruſed thy Reflections upon the Conduct of Human Life, &c. I was, and ſtill am pleaſed with all that tends to the Propagation of Original and Neceſſary Truth, but rejoyce*

where I find it ſpring from an upright Mind, pure Intention, and *clean Veſſel*. What Reaſon has he to queſtion or prejudge the Uprightneſs of my Mind, or the Purity of my Intention, or the Cleanneſs of my Veſſel? Either this is very impertinently, or very uncharitably ſuggeſted. Either he means nothing by it, or he means ill. And that he does ſo, he has taken Care to ſatisfie the Reader, by explaining himſelf more fully in the very next Words, *For whoſo* (ſays he) *undertakes to reprehend the Intelligible Conduct of Human Life, ought firſt to purge himſelf from the Irregularities of his Moral Conduct, which does Cloud and darken his Underſtanding.* What a ſcurvy malicious Inſinuation is this! For tho the Words abſtractly conſider'd be a Propoſition of Univerſal Truth, and may bear an innocent and inoffenſive Senſe, yet conſider'd with their *Occaſion*, and with their *Application* to me, if they ſignifie any thing they muſt ſignifie ill; there muſt be either an intolerable Impertinence in them, or a great deal of Malice and Cenſoriouſneſs. For does he not by this plainly inſinuate to the World that I am an ill Man, and that there are ſuch Irregularities in my *Moral* Conduct as make

me

me unfit to reflect upon the *Intellectual* Conduct of Human Life? And would not any one that knew nothing of me any otherwise than by this Paper of his, and were to take his Measure of me from hence, be tempted to conclude, that I was a Man of a loose and debauch'd Conversation? Now if I deserve this Character, I have nothing to complain of; but if I do not, (and I appeal even to Mr. *Vickris* himself, nay, even to the World, whether I do or no) then this is a very uncharitable and very unchristian Insinuation.

And yet as bad as it is, he has more of the same; and that notwithstanding what he says of himself in the Paragraph immediately following, that he is *far from a Spirit of Detraction*. Which Passage I think should either have been left out, or set at a greater distance from the foregoing one, wherein, there seems to be so strong a Savour of that Spirit. As there does in what follows, when (p. 4.) He charges me with despising the Testimony of God through the Meanness of the Instruments: Applying to me that of the Apostle to the *Thessalonians*, chap. 4. v. 8. *He therefore that despiseth, despiseth not Man but God, who hath also*

given unto us his Holy Spirit. Which Allegation I shall allow to be pertinent, when he has proved those *Instruments* he talks of to be equally inspired with the Apostles: But till then he must give me leave to think and call it a Blasphemous piece of Arrogance. For it can be no less to make Despising the Quakers the same with despising God, unless it be proved that the Quakers are Divinely inspired. When I see this done, I shall allow of the Expression: In the mean while I must beg *Mr. Vinkris* not to be angry, if I tell him that it puts me in mind of a Story I have heard of a Quaker in *Oxford*, who when some of the young Scholars for some Rudenesses and Disturbances he had been guilty of in the College, had brought him to the Pump to pump him, while he was doing his Penance, impudently cried out, *Pump on, Pump on, you Pump not me, but the Lord.* I will not say *Mr. Vinkris* his Expression is exactly of a piece with this, but there is so much Resemblance between them, that assoon as I read one, I could not chuse but think of t'other.

But he goes on in his Censorious and Uncharitable Reflections; for after he had

had quoted (*Page 6.*) that Paſſage out of the Book of *Wiſdom*, chap. 1. v. 4. *Into a malicious Soul Wiſdom will not enter, nor dwell in the Body that is ſubject to Sin. For the Holy Spirit of Diſcipline will fly Deceit, and remove from Thoughts that are without Underſtanding, and will not abide when Unrighteouſneſs cometh in. For Wiſdom is a loving Spirit, and will not acquit a Blaſphemer of his Words; for God is the Witneſs of his Reins, and a true Beholder of his Heart, and an Hearer of his Tongue. Therefore he that ſpeaketh unrighteous things can't be hid, neither ſhall Vengeance when it puniſhes paſs by him.* All which in the abundance of his Civility and Charity he has thought fit to apply to me. He proceeds to add, *Now ſeeing theſe Sayings are true and righteous, and that 'tis poſſible to profeſs this Doctrin of the Divine Word, Light, Grace, Spirit of Wiſdom and Truth, and the teachings of it, and yet not poſſeſs it, nor be learn'd of it, nor led by it, but whilſt preaching of it to others to be a Caſt-a-way: I adviſe thee to conſider in what Ground and Nature thou yet ſtandeſt and liveſt in, and what Spirit lives and rules in thee.* I thank him for his Advice, but not for that ſpiteful and ſtrangely cenſorious Inſi-

Insinuation that goes along with it, which amounts to no less, than that I am one of those malicious Souls into which Wisdom will not enter; that I am deceitful, without Understanding, unrighteous, and a Blasphemer: That tho I profess the Doctrin of the Divine Light, yet I do not possess it, nor am led by it, but while I preach it to others, am my self a Cast-away; which I think is as bad as one Man can well say of another, and yet 'tis what he plainly insinuates, if there be any Connection or Pertinence in what he says.

But fearing he had not been yet plain enough, and lest the too candid Reader should miss his Meaning, he proceeds, *Hath not Unrighteousness entred in through Self-love and Esteem, which blinds the Eye, and causes the Tongue to speak Unrighteous things?* Here he charges me with Unrighteousness, Ambition and Self-love; which last he is pleased to heighten to such an extravagant pitch, as to make me an Idolater, and that of the worst sort, as making my self to be my God. For says he, *Is not Self exalted to sit in the Temple of God, as God in thee?* What a Flight of Censoriousness

ſoriouſneſs and Uncharity is this! For beſides the Heinouſneſs of the Charge, (it being as bad as can be ſaid of the Devil himſelf, that he makes Self his God, there being nothing ſo oppoſite to Charity which refers all to God, as Self-love, which refers all to its ſelf) I ſay, beſides the Heinouſneſs of the Charge, 'tis alſo of ſuch a particular Nature, as were I indeed guilty of it, it would be impoſſible for any Man, much more for Mr. *Vickris*, who is a meer Stranger to me, without a Divine Revelation ever to know. For Self-love is a Vice of the Heart, and one of the moſt latent and retired of all the Vices that are lodged there, and conſequently obnoxious to his Judgment only who is a Diſcerner of the Heart, to whom all Hearts be open, all Deſires known, and from whom no Secret is hid. God alone can tell how far *Self* is exalted either in me, or in any Man elſe: And therefore Mr. *Vickris* had much better have left me to His Judgment, than to ſit in Judgment upon me himſelf, and paſs ſo ſevere a Sentence in a Cauſe that does not, cannot fall within his Cognizance.

Nor

Nor is he ſatisfy'd with repreſenting me as an ill *Man*, but he muſt alſo find fault with me for being a *Scholar*. *Art thou not decking thy ſelf with thy corrupt Wiſdom*, (ſays he) *which is the forbidden Fruit, and will prove Folly in the end?* By which I ſuppoſe he muſt mean Philoſophy, and the Study of Arts and Sciences, which he will needs have to be corrupt Wiſdom, and the Forbidden Fruit. Now tho I not only grant, but in a Treatiſe purpoſely written upon this Subject, have expreſly contended, and if I miſtake not, fully demonſtrated, that conſidering the preſent State of Man, the Study of Learning and Knowledg is no farther allowable, than as 'tis conducive to the moralizing of his Life, and that all Proſecution of it beyond or beſide this End, is an immoderate and blameable Curioſity; yet I hope as far as it is apt to ſerve the Intereſt of a good Life, there is no reaſon to diſallow or condemn it. Tho it be not to be allow'd any farther, yet I think it may and muſt be allow'd ſo far. And herein I think I ſtate the meaſure of proſecuting Learning and Knowledge in a due *mean*, between the Extremes of thoſe over-inquiſitive

inquisitive Spirits on the one hand, who set no Limits to their Curiosity, and those narrow and contracted ones on the other who confine it too straitly, condemning all Human Learning in gross, under the reproachful Appellations of *Carnal Reason*, *Corrupt Wisdom*, *Vain Philosophy*, and the like; under which Characters I think it ought not to be represented, as far as it is apt to serve and minister to the Interest of Religion and a good Life. And that it may be serviceable to that purpose, I might undertake to shew, but that the excellent Mr. *Boyle* has saved me the trouble in a late Treatise upon this very Subject, call'd, *The Christian Virtuoso*. I cannot therefore but wonder what should make Mr. *Vickris* (who is himself a Scholar) thus condemn all Human Learning in gross, under the Name of *Corrupt Wisdom*, and blame me for *decking* my self with it, especially considering that a little after (*Page* 10) he supposes the Divine Light to assist the Natural Faculties of the Soul in the Attainment of Arts and Sciences: Why then does he tell me of decking my self with my Corrupt Wisdom? What, does the Divine Light assist the Natural Faculties of the Soul in the Attainment of Corrupt

Corrupt Wiſdom, and ſuch as will prove Folly in the end? Can that Wiſdom be corrupt, which is taught us by the Aſſiſtance of the Divine Light? Or is that Light to be eſteem'd Divine, whoſe Inſtructions are ſo corrupt? How are theſe things conſiſtent, unleſs Mr. *Vickris* will be underſtood not of condemning Human Learning in general as Corrupt, but only that which is the Object of my particular Study; as if my Studies were not directed to the ends of a good Life, which would be as great a *Cenſure*, as the other is a *Contradiction*. So that in ſhort, he is neceſſarily reduced to this *Dilemma*, Either he condemns Human Learning in groſs, as corrupt, and then he *contradicts himſelf*, in making the Divine Light aſſiſtant to it; or he condemns the particular matter of my Study as corrupt, and then he *Cenſures me*.

As he does again moſt unpardonably, (*Page* 7.) telling me, that I *wilfully blaſt the Fame of God's Name and Work in the Earth, in and by his People, becauſe they agree not with Man's Ways and Conceited wiſe Notions*. Which is a Charge next to that of committing the Sin againſt the Holy Ghoſt. For does Mr.

Mr. *Vickris* consider what it is wilfully to blast the Fame of God's Name and Work? Or does he consider how intimately acquainted a Man had need be with another Man's *Interiour*, to be able to pronounce what degrees of *Wilfulness* there are in his *Overt Acts*? Does he well consider this? The best Apology I can make for him, is to say, that he does not. And yet as if he had said nothing amiss, but were secure of the Truth of his Charge, he wipes his Mouth, and very gravely applies to me two of the most severe Texts of Scripture that he could pick out in all the Bible, namely, the 12th *Verse* of the 2d of *Peter* the 2d, and the 10th *Verse* of the Epistle of St. *Jude*, which tho through a guilty Modesty he would not speak out, I shall. The Words are, *But these, as natural Brute Beasts, made to be taken and destroy'd, speak evil of the things that they understand not, and shall utterly perish in their own Corruption.* And again, *But these speak evil of those things which they know not; but what they know naturally as Brute Beasts, in those things they corrupt themselves.* Upon my Word very civilly, and very charitably applied: But there are some Men, who tho they revile those they disaffect

diſaffect never ſo bitterly, ſo it be done with the Solemnity of a Text, and in Scripture Phraſe, think they charge in *Armour*, and have a Warrant for their moſt abuſive Scurrility. And ſo having pour'd out the Dregs of his Venom, he concludes this Reprehenſion-Part, having (as he words it) *diſcharged* himſelf to me on the aforemention'd occaſion. I think he might very properly ſay, *He has diſcharged himſelf*, having thrown up ſuch a deal of Choler and other Filth. Indeed (Poor Man) his Stomach was very Foul, and 'twas high time to have it clear'd. And yet 'tis not all up yet; he has not yet ſo fully *diſcharg'd* himſelf, but that we find him *Reaching* again toward the End of the Book. For after he had paſs'd a diſingenuos Reflection upon my Reaſon and Conſcience, in wiſhing they were both reform'd, (which implies, that at preſent they are both very corrupt) and after he had charg'd me with no leſs than *Evil Preſumption* and *Blaſphemy* againſt ſome that dwell in Heaven, and *Prophaneneſs* into the Bargain, in the Extravagance of his Zeal and Paſſion he cries out, *What art thou, O Man, that boaſteſt thy ſelf? Art thou wiſer than thy Maker?* Threatning me

Page 13.

Page 15.

me withal in the Style, and with the Authority of a Prophet, that God ſhall confound my Wiſdom, and bring to naught my Underſtanding wherein it is exalted; for he hath determin'd to ſtain the Pride of all Fleſh, the Mouth of the Lord hath ſpoken it: Taking for granted that my Underſtanding is exalted beyond its due Limits, and that I abound with Pride. Which indeed are all of them fine Cenſures, conſidering the illneſs of the things ſuggeſted, and the little Knowledg Mr. *Vickris* has of me; upon whom he is pleaſed to beſtow one ſtroke of Civility more at parting, telling me, *This is written for the clearing of Truth's Teſtimony from the Rubbiſh thou haſt caſt thereon.* What a rude uneducated Pen does this Gentleman write with! Whether it be his Anger, or his ill Nature, or his Perſwaſion, that ſo uncivilizes him, I will not ſtay to examin; but upon the whole matter, I think he has given me no ſmall occaſion to ſuſpect that this was written, not ſo much for the *Clearing of Truth*, as for the clearing, that is, the *diſcharging* himſelf, and the ridding his Stomach of an uneaſie Load, which now he is diſcharg'd of, I hope he will ſleep in quiet.

And thus having given the World a View of ſome of the Rudeneſſes of this Author, (for in mercy to the Reader as well as to my Adverſary, I have not ſet down all) I now dare appeal to the ſame Judge, whether ſuch foul reflecting Expreſſions as theſe become either the Breeding of a Gentleman, or the Charity of a Chriſtian, or the Pretenſions of a Quaker. I ſay, the Pretenſions of a *Quaker*; for tho the Quakers do not pretend to the External Civilities either of Language or of Behaviour, but rather ſeem to diſtinguiſh themſelves by an oppoſite Ruſticity in each; yet 'tis well known that they make high Pretenſions to *Charity*, particularly to that moſt Chriſtian part of it that conſiſts in *Meekneſs* and *Gentleneſs*, in Patience and Long-ſuffering, in a quiet and paſſive temper of Spirit. To theſe (as 'tis well known) their Pretenſions run ſo high, as to offer to turn the other Cheek to the Smiter; nay, even to ſcruple the Lawfulneſs of *War*, which it ſeems is too rough a thing for ſuch calm inoffenſive Creatures as they, all made up of Love and Sweetneſs.

But

But now let any but a Quaker judg how well Mr. *Vickris* has maintain'd this Character. Had I been never so grosse in misrepresenting the Quakers Principle, I could not have deserv'd such a Barbarous Treatment from him; or if I had, yet it would not have been consistent with his so highly Christian Pretensions to give it me. No, he should have suffer'd rather, and have return'd Good for Evil. At least he should have had so much regard to their so greatly pretended Principle of *Meekness*, as not to suffer himself to run into such Intemperances of Passion and Language, as he appears now to be guilty of. Is this the Charity, is this the Meekness of a Quaker? If it be, then *Sit Animamea*, Let my Soul be with the Philosophers, shall I say? Or with the *Men of the World*; or indeed with any Men, rather than with such a bitter foul-mouth'd Sect as this. What the Temper of this Gentleman is in his Conversation I know not, but if he governs his Tongue no better than he does his Pen, (and 'tis strange if he should) I think 'twould be a Blessing both to himself and others, if he were *Speechless*. For the Language of the

latter is so very foul, that I believe the Arch-Angel in his Dispute with the Devil about the Body of *Moses*, did not only use better to him, (which would be but a small matter) but receiv'd better from him. I'm sure he could not well receive worse. And now we are upon Scripture-Allusion, I shall beg leave to offer one Text to Mr. *Vickris* his Consideration, in requital to those many severe ones he has set before mine. This Gentleman is both by his Principles and by his express Declaration in this Paper, a great Despiser of that Wisdom which is from below (otherwise by him call'd corrupt Wisdom) and a great Pretender to that Wisdom which is from above; let him hear then and consider what St. *James* says, *The Wisdom that is from above is first pure, then peaceable, gentle*, &c. With which I conclude this part, and so pass on from the *Passion* to the *Argument* that is contain'd in this Paper.

Jam. 3. 17.

And here, if there be any Dependence upon that Saying, that *Strong Passions produce weak Arguments*, I may hence take a Presage of a Successful Issue in the present Engagement. But how-

however for fear of the worſt, I think it neceſſary here in the Entrance to advertize the Reader, that the Queſtion now in Debate beween us, is not concerning the Truth of the Quakers Principles, but concerning the Truth of my Repreſentation of them; not whether their Principles are true in themſelves, but whether they are truly repreſented by me. So that if Mr. *Vickris* ſhould have the Fortune to win the Stake, it would only be a private perſonal Victory, without any Advantage to the *Cauſe* of *Quakeriſm*, which is not concern'd in the Iſſue of this Diſpute.

This being premiſed, I muſt further acquaint the Reader, that the Book which Mr. *Vickris* excepts againſt, as guilty of miſreporting their Principles, is my *Reflections upon the Conduct of Human Life*, particularly in the Poſtſcript added to the Second Edition, where I undertake to give ſome Account of the difference between my Notion of the Divine Light, and the Quakers Light within. And this I do in ſeveral Articles diſtinctly, which becauſe of the frequent recourſe that we ſhall have to them in the Sequel, it will be a Satisfaction to have here ſet

down. They are therefore as follows:

I. The Quakers usually talk of this Light within as of some Divine *Communication* or Manifestation only, whereas I make it to be the very *Essence* and *Substance* of the Deity, which I suppose vertually to contain all things in it, and to be intimately united to our Minds.

II. The Quakers represent this Light within as a sort of *Extraordinary Inspiration* (whence they have the Name of *Enthysiasts*) whereas I suppose it to be a Man's *Natural* and *Ordinary* way of Understanding.

III. The Quakers (if I mistake not) confine their Light within to some certain Objects, namely, Moral and Spiritual Truths, in order only to the direction of Practice, and accordingly make it a Suppliment to *Scripture*, which they say is not sufficient without it, nor indeed any more than a meer *Dead Letter*. But now I do not appropriate this Divine Light to Moral or Spiritual things, but extend it as far as all Truth; yea, as far as all that is Intelligible,

telligible, which I ſuppoſe to be perceiv'd and underſtood in this Divine Light, as I have explain'd it.

IV. The Quakers make their Light within a ſpecial Privilege of a certain Order of Men, their own Party. Not inded as to the *Poſſibility*, becauſe they ſuppoſe all Men to be indifferently capable of this Divine Illumination, as may appear from their contending againſt Predeſtination, and for Univerſal Grace. But tho they do not make it a ſpecial Privilege as to the *Poſſibility*, yet they do as to the *Act*, making none but thoſe of their own Way to be actually enlighten'd by it. Whereas according to my Principles this is no ſpecial Privilege, but the common and univerſal Benefit of all Men; yea, of all the Intelligent Creation, who all ſee and underſtand in this Light of God, without which there would be neither *Truth* nor *Underſtanding*.

V. The Quakers by their Light within underſtand ſome determinate *form'd* Dictate or Propoſition, expreſly and poſitively directing and inſtructing them to do ſo or ſo. Whereas my Light is only the *Eſſential* Truth of

God, which indeed is always present to my Understanding, as being intimately united with it, but does not formally enlighten or instruct me, but when I attend to it, and consult it, and read what is written in those Divine Ideal Characters.

VI. And Lastly, The Quakers do not offer any rational or intelligible Account of their Light within, neither as to the thing, nor as to the mode of it, but only *Cant* in some loose general Expressions about the *Light*, which they confirm with the Authority of St. *John*'s Gospel, tho they understand neither one nor t'other. Whereas I have offer'd a Natural, Distinct and Philosophical way of explaining both, namely, by the Omniformity of the Ideal World, or the Divine Λόγος, who has in himself the Essences and Idea's of all things, and in whom the same are perceiv'd by us and by all Creatures.

Now this Mr. *Vickris* is pleased to censure as a Misrepresentation of the Quaker's Principle concerning the Light within. But before I proceed to consider whether it be or no, there are two

two intermedial Passages of his that expect to be taken notice of. I had said in my Reflections, *pag.* 77. speaking of the Light within as untowardly represented by the Quakers, that the thing in it self rightly understood is true, and if any such shall yet call it Quakerism or Enthysiasm, that 'tis such Quakerism as makes a good part of St. *John's* Gospel, and of St. *Austin's* Works. And so again to the like purpose in my Postscript, that if the Quakers understood their own Notion, and knew how to explain it, and into what Principles to resolve it, it would not much differ from mine: Of which two Passages Mr. *Vickris* endeavours to make a notable Advantage, and fancies that they mightily befriend the Cause of Quakerism, as *implying a sort of Confession to their Principle*, and that the Difference between us would only be *in Terminis*. But is the Man in good earnest? Or does he think that he writes to one that understands not what belongs to Consequence, and will be imposed upon by any thing? Does it therefore follow that I confess the Truth of the Quakers Principle of the Light, because I allow the Notion in its self to be true when rightly understood, Page 7.

that

that is, when taken in a right Sense? What, does the General Truth of any Notion rightly stated infer the Truth of this or that particular way of explaining it? May there not be a false and erroneous Explication of a true *Hypothesis*? Suppose I should say that the Doctrin of *Justification by Faith only* is a true Notion rightly understood, do I thereby confess the Truth of the *Solifidian* way of understanding it, who so explain our being justifyed by Faith only, as to exclude the concurrence of Obedience? Or, Suppose I should say that the Doctrin of *Pleasures being our Supreme Good* is a true Doctrin rightly understood, do I thereby acknowledge it to be true in that Sense of the Proposition usually attributed to *Epicurus*? Or (to put these two Instances together) can I justly be supposed to imply that the *Solifidian* and the *Epicurean* differ from their respective Adversaries only *in Terminis*, because I acknowledg that the Notions in themselves rightly understood are true? If Mr. *Vickris* had but been at the pains to *deck* himself with a little more of that *Corrupt Wisdom*, call'd *Logic*, he would never have imposed upon himself, nor have offer'd to impose upon me with such Woman-

Womaniſh Conſequences as theſe.

The other Paſſage that I muſt take in my way, is his general Complaint againſt me, for not quoting the Quakers own Words and Authors in repreſenting their Principle. Now to this I anſwer, that having in my time read ſeveral of the moſt conſiderable of the Quakers Books, and (as I thought) well enough comprehended them as far as they were *intelligible*, I thought I might truſt my Memory ſo far, as to venture to repreſent their Senſe as to one (and that the moſt remarkable) of their Principles, without ranſacking their Books, and muſtering up Quotations, which at that time I could not very well do neither, having but few of them by me. But neither ſhould I have thought it neceſſary if I had had never ſo many. For ſure a Man may venture to give an Account of one Notorious Principle belonging to a certain Perſwaſion, and to ſhew the difference between that and another, upon the Stock of his former Reading, without being obliged to bring an Author to atteſt to every thing he ſays. Thus were I to ſtate the general Difference between the *Carteſian* and the *Ariſtotelean* Philo- Page 8.

phy,

ſophy, might I not ſecurely place it in this, that the one offers to explain *Appearances* of Nature by *Forms* and *Qualities*, and other ſuch abſtruſe Beings, which the other chuſes to reſolve into the more ſimple and intelligible Principles of *Figure* and *Motion*, &c. without appealing preſently either to the Text of *Ariſtotle*, or to the Principles of *Deſcartes*? Or ſuppoſe I were askt the Difference between a *Socinian* and a *Mahumetan*, might I not be allow'd to ſay, that tho the *Socinian* denies the Divinity of Chriſt as well as the *Mahumetan*, and the *Mahumetan* owns him as a true Prophet as well as the *Socinian*, yet they differ in this, that whereas the *Mahumetan* allows him to have been only a Temporary Prophet, and that his Religion is now ſuperannuated, as having had it's Time; the *Socinian* acknowledges him to be a Prophet of a perpetual Authority, and that his Religion is ever obliging, as being the laſt and ſtanding Revelation of God: I ſay, might I not be allowed to ſtate the difference thus between them *without Book*, but I muſt needs be put upon fetching Proofs, Chapter and Verſe, out of *Socinus* and the *Alcoran*? Mr. *Vickris* might therefore well have ſpared

this

this Objection, without any prejudice either to the Beauty, or to the Strength of his Diſcourſe; eſpecially conſidering, that he himſelf is not pleaſed to bring ſo much as one ſingle Citation out of any one Quakeriſh Writer, (for that Paſſage of *Barclay*'s (*pag.* 5.) is quoted upon another occaſion) to diſprove the Repreſentation of their Principle given by me. Now Mr. *Vickris* was much more concerned to alledge Teſtimonies out of Authors than I, as undertaking to ſhew that Repreſentation of mine to be falſe, which I was then contented barely to *propoſe*, not to *prove*. For tho' it was poſſible for me to give an Account (and that a right one too) of the Quakers Principle, without producing any of their Teſtimonies, yet it was not poſſible for Mr. *Vickris* to prove that Account of mine to be falſe, without referring to their Books. Becauſe 'tis one thing barely to *propoſe*, which was my Undertaking, and another thing to *prove*, which was his. Since therefore Mr. *Vickris* thought fit to ſave himſelf the Trouble of appealing to Authors when more concerned to do ſo, he might well forgive it me, the only thing material in this buſineſs being, not whether I quote their Books

or

or no, but whether I have given a true Account of their Principle, which is the thing that now comes to be examined.

And here that Mr. *Vickris* may not have the least Ground to suspect or pretend that I contrive things to my own Advantage, by picking and chusing what I can best Answer, or that I misrepresent his Arguments, by reporting them in my own Words, or that I omit or conceal any part of their Strength, I will deal so fairly and squarely with him, as to set down at large his Exceptions against every one of the forementiond Articles, applying to them their respective Answers distinctly.

Exception against the First Article.

I. THou sayst, the Quakers usually talk of this Light within, as of some Divine Communication and Manifestation only. How does this appear to be true? Thou quotest no Author for it. I apprehend thou intendest hereby, or else thy Assertion has little weight or matter in it, *viz.* That the Quakers own the Light within to be an Accident, and not a substantial inherent

herent Principle of Divine Excellency; which is a great Miſtake, and 'tis to be fear'd a wilful one too, ſeeing 'tis generally known, and thou confeſſeſt it too, that they quote the Teſtimony of *John* the Evangeliſt for their Principle, as thou haſt done for thine, they believing according thereunto, *Chap.* 1. *v* 4. *In him was Life*, and the Life *was the Light of Men:* And if the Life of the Word be the Light of Men, then ſurely the Quakers cannot be ſuppoſed to believe in any thing leſs than a real Spiritual Subſtance, which the Soul of Man is capable to feel and apprehend: For all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made, *John* 1. 3. Thus thy firſt Diſtinction falls to the ground.

The Anſwer.

SUppoſe for the preſent, that the Senſe intended in the Aſſertion were what Mr. *Vickris* apprehends it (tho the Antitheſis or counter-part of the Article plainly implies the contrary) that the Quakers repreſent their Light within after the nature and manner of an *Accident*, and not as a *Subſtantial* Principle. I ſay as a Subſtantial Principle; for

for as for a Subſtantial *Inherent* Principle I know not what to make of it, it being the firſt time that I ever heard that *Inherency* was an Attribute belonging to Subſtance. Leaving out therefore by Mr. *Vickris* his Leave this ill-ſuited Term, which I fancy happen'd to ſlip in while he was taking a Nod over his Paper; ſuppoſe, I ſay, my Meaning were, that the Quakers repreſent their Light not as a *Subſtantial* Being, but rather as an *Accident*, how does he make out the contrary? Why, he tells me this is a great Miſtake. But may I not reply to him in his own Language, *How does this appear to be true? Thou quoteſt no Author for it.* But tho he produces no Authority, yet he offers at an Argument, the Sum of which is this, The Quakers building upon the Authority of St. *John*, make the Life of the Word to be the Light of Men, and therefore muſt be ſuppoſed to make it a Subſtance, the Life of the Word being confeſſedly ſo. But if this be all Mr. *Vickris* has to ſay for his Point, he is very ſhort of proving what he undertakes, tho at the ſame time what he undertakes be nothing to the purpoſe. For tho it be true, that both the *Word*, and the *Life* of the Word

Word are real Substances, yet this Proposition, *The Life of the Word is the Light of Men*, considered simply in its self, without depending upon some proper and peculiar Hypothesis that shall limit and determin its signification, does not at all infer, that the Light here is a Substance. For the Word may be said to be the Light (unless a contrary Hypothesis oblige us to understand otherwise) *Efficiently*, as it causes our Illumination, as it enlightens and instructs by assisting the Understanding, according to the common receiv'd Notion, as well as *Formally*, by being it self the Formal and Immediate Object of our Conception. And so when Christ says of himself, *I am the Light of the World*, there is no necessity, I mean from the Words themselves, of understanding them in a *Formal* way of Predication; but the Sense may very well be, what it is generally presumed to be, that he is the Author, or *Efficient* Cause of our Illumination. Which is allow'd to be sometimes the certain and necessary Acceptation of the Particle (*is*), whereof we have a remarkable Example, *Ephes.*2.14. *He is our Peace*, that is, the Author or Procurer of our Peace. And if these Propositions are

not of themselves determin'd to a Formal Sense, but may aptly enough be taken *Efficiently* as well as *Formally*, then their grounding their Principle of the Light upon these or such like Expressions does not infer that they hold it to be a Substantial Being.

And it does not of necessity neither, tho we should suppose them to understand that Proposition of St. *John* in a *Formal* Sense. Indeed in case the Word be Formally the Light of Men, it will truly follow, that the Light is a Substance, because the Word it self is so. And if the Quakers do construe the Proposition in such a Sense, that is, *Formally*, it will also follow that they ought (if they will be consistent with themselves) to make the Light to be a real Substance. But it will not follow that they actually and expresly do so, unless it were necessary that Men should always so strictly attend to the Consequences of what they lay down, as never to say any thing inconsistent with their Principles; which is an Happiness that Men of more Logical Heads than the Quakers are generally presumed to be, would give a great deal to be secure of. So that whether the Pro-

Propoſition be taken Efficiently or Formally, it does by no means follow from their bare quoting thoſe Words from St. *John* in the behalf of their Principle, (which yet is the only Argument Mr. *Vickris* is pleaſed to inſiſt upon) that the Quakers do profeſs their Light to be a Subſtantial Being. I do not ſay they do not, but only that had that been the Senſe of my Aſſertion, Mr. *Vickris* is far from proving the contrary by vertue of the Argument he has uſed.

But why muſt that needs be the Senſe of my Aſſertion? Why, becauſe otherwiſe, as he conceits, there will not be much weight or matter in it. No? Suppoſe this ſhould be the Senſe of it, (as 'tis plain from the Antitheſis that it is) *That the Quakers repreſent their Light not as God himſelf, but only as a Divine Communication*, that is, *as ſomething communicated or exhibited by God, whereas I make the Light to be the very Eſſence and Subſtance of the Deity*, &c. Will he ſay there is little Weight in this Aſſertion? Is not the Difference very material, if true? And that this is the natural, nay, the neceſſary Senſe of the Article is ſo evident from the

Antitheſis, that I wonder how a Man of Mr. *Vickris* his Apprehenſion could miſs of it. For (as he will quickly ſee, if he review the place with the leaſt Attention) the Oppoſition between my Notion of the Divine Light, and that of the Quakers, is not made to conſiſt in this, that *they* make it to be an Accident, and *I* a Subſtance; but in this, that they repreſent it as ſomething only communicated, exhibited or manifeſted by God, (whether as an Accident or a Subſtance I was not then concerned to conſider) whereas in my Account it is the very Eſſence and Subſtance of the Deity, exhibitive of all Truth, and always preſential to our Mind. And therefore when 'tis ſaid, that the Quakers uſually talk of the Light within as of ſome Divine Communication or Manifeſtation only; the Term (*only*) is not excluſive of Subſtance in general, but of the Divine Subſtance, or Eſſence of God. I know very well, and have no temptation to diſſemble it, that 'tis the expreſs Doctrin of the Quakers, that the Divine Light is a Subſtance, not an Accident. For they make it the Principle of Regeneration, which they all ſay, (and Mr. *Keith* has taken a great deal of Pains to prove it) is a *Subſtantial* Life,

Way to the City of God, p. 62.

Life, as much as the Life of Vegetation, Senſation, or Reaſon is; and as far as I can apprehend, the Notion may be ſound and true enough in its ſelf, and wants only to be fix'd upon a right Bottom. And I know that Mr. *Barclay* in his Apology, lately Printed in Folio with the reſt of his Works, ſays expreſly, *We underſtand not this Seed, Light or Grace to be an Accident, as moſt Men ignorantly do, but a Real, Spiritual Subſtance, which the Soul of Man is capable to Feel and Apprehend; from which that Real, Spiritual, Inward Birth in Believers ariſes, call'd the New Creature, the New Man in the Heart.* Page 334.

But tho it be too plain to be denied, that the Quakers make the Light to be a real Subſtance, yet 'tis alſo as plain, that they do not make it the very Subſtance of God. By *this Seed, Grace and Word of God and Light*, (ſays Mr. *Barclay*) *wherewith we ſay every Man is enlightned, and hath a meaſure of it, which ſtrives with them in order to ſave them, and which may by the Stubbornneſs and Wickedneſs of Man's Will be quench'd, bruiſed, wounded, preſſed down, ſlain and crucified, we underſtand not the proper Eſſence and Nature of God preciſely taken,* Apology, p. 133.

which is not Divisible into Parts and Measures, as being a most pure simple Being, void of all Composition or Division, and therefore can neither be resisted, hurt, wounded, crucified or slain by all the Efforts and Strength of Men. But we understand a Spiritual, Heavenly and Invisible Principle, in which God as Father, Son and Spirit dwells; a measure of which Divine and glorious Life is in all men, as a Seed, which of its own Nature draws, invites and inclines to God. And this we call Vehiculum Dei, *or the Spiritual Body of Christ, the Flesh and Blood of Christ which came down from Heaven, of which all the Saints do feed, and are thereby nourish'd unto eternal Life.* Whether there be any such thing as this *Vehiculum Dei*, or Spiritual Body of Christ, (which is a Notion several Learned Men both before and since the appearance of Quakerism have entertain'd upon the reading the *6th Chapter* of St. *John*) I have neither Cause nor Mind at present to dispute. But I think 'tis plain from this Account Mr. *Barclay* gives of the Light, that tho it be a Substance, yet 'tis not the same with, but really distinct from the Substance or Essence of God. For it is not *Deus*, but *Vehiculum Dei*. And to the like purpose Mr. *Keith*,

another

another of their most considerable Writers, speaking of the Seed of God, (which is the same with the Light now in Question) says, that *it is not the Godhead it self, but a certain middle Nature, Substance or Being, between the Godhead and Mankind, &c.* Again, says he, p. 131. *This middle Nature I call a Divine Substance or Essence, not as if it were the Godhead it self, or a Particle or Portion of it, but because of its excellency above all other things next unto the Godhead, as on such an Account Men do call other things Divine which are very excellent, &c.* Again says he in the next Paragraph, *This excellent and intermediate Being may be called the Divine Being, because the Godhead is most immediately manifest therein, and dwelleth in it, as in the most Holy Place, or Holy of Holyes.* More Testimonies I might, but I think need not add, it being sufficiently clear from these cited out of Mr. *Barclay* and Mr. *Keith*, that the Quakers do not hold their Light to be the very Substance and Essence of the Deity, though at the same time I think they ought, and that they are inconsistent with themselves in that they do not. For that Text of St. *John, In him was Life, and the Life was the Light of Men*, which they quote to

Way to the City of God, p. 130.

prove the Light to be a Substantial Principle, does not prove so much as that, unless the Proposition be understood *Formally*; and if it be, then it proves a great deal more, *viz.* That 'tis not only a Substance, (which is all they infer from it) but also a Divine Substance strictly speaking, even the very Essence of the Deity. And indeed what less than that can be a Light to the Soul? How can any thing that is not God, or that is created, be so? But 'tis not my present Business to consider what the Quakers ought to say, but what they do say. 'Tis plain, that they do not make the Divine Light to be the proper Substance of God, but a certain middle Nature; and 'tis as plain that I do, which lays a sufficient ground of Difference between us; so that my first Distinction is so far from falling to the Ground, that it stands upon firmer Ground than ever; and if my Adversary has but the Understanding and the Ingenuity of a Man, I dare appeal to him whether he be not fairly Answer'd and Confuted as far as concerns this first Particular. But whatever his Judgment be, I presume the Judicious Reader will be of mine, and so give me leave to advance forward to the

Ex-

Exception against the Second Article.

THY Second is as insignificant, and like an Arrow shot at random, lights on thy own Head, being attended with some contradiction to thy former. Thou sayest, the Quakers represent this Light within as a sort of extraordinary Inspiration. Where learn'st thou this? Before it was a Divine Communication and Manifestation only, and now an extraordinary Inspiration. Thou wouldst have done well to have let the Quakers Principle alone till thou hadst learnt it better, and more honestly to represent it. Is not Extraordinary, more than Common, or Communication and Manifestation *only*? Have not the Quakers declared the Light to be Universal, as well as Divine, in its Gift and Manifestation to the Sons of Men? It is certainly true they have; and yet I deny not but such who apply their Minds in Obedience to the teachings of this Light and Heavenly Gift, may be made Partakers of more, *viz.* Extraordinary Gifts and Graces by the Inspiration of the same Spirit. If for this they have the Name of *Enthusiasts* given them, as in this Section of thy Postscript, tho it be in Derision, they will rejoyce

rejoyce in it; for it shall be as an Ornament of Grace to their Head, and Chains about their Neck. Again in the same Section thou say'st I suppose it, viz. The Light within to be *a Man's natural and ordinary way of Understanding*. And just before thou madest it to be the very Essence and Substance of the Deity, which are thy own express Words: See thy Confusion and Self-contradiction. By these Words, a Man's Natural and Ordinary Way of Understanding I take thee to intend the same thing as in pag. 77. where thou call'st it Reason and Conscience, and yet at the same time call'st it, The Divine Seed and Region of Truth, in which are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge, the great and universal Oracle lodg'd in every Man's Breast, whereof the ancient Urim and Thummim was an express Type or Emblem. Here thou debatest and confoundest thy Principle, making it to be a part of Man's Nature, whereas the Principle of Divine Light as held by the Quakers, is a distinct thing from Man's Soul, Reason, or Natural Conscience, viz. a more excellent Spirit and Principle. And herein I confess is a material Difference betwixt thy Principle of Light

and

and the Quakers, as thou hast expreſs'd it. Sure I am, it is a great Error to render the Divine λογος by which all things were made, and are upheld, to be no higher a Principle than Man's Reaſon and Conſcience, or natural and ordinary way of Underſtanding, which Reaſon is a Property Eſſential to him as Man. I confeſs to know the things of a Man, according to that Scripture, 1 Cor. 2. 9, 10, 14. *But as it is written, Eye hath not ſeen, nor Ear heard, &c.* By which it manifeſtly appears, that the true Knowledge of God and Spiritual Things are attain'd by the Spirit, which is ſuperiour to Man's rational Principle or natural Conſcience, which may be defiled and corrupted, as 'tis ſaid expreſly of the impure, that even their Mind and Conſcience is defiled.

The Anſwer.

THIS Second Exception, conſiſting of ſeveral things, muſt be ſeverally conſider'd. First, He demands of me where I learnt, that the Quakers repreſent this Light within as a ſort of extraordinary Inſpiration? But before I anſwer his Queſtion, I muſt ſettle the Meaning of my own Words, which he is pleaſed to take in a Senſe quite

different

different from what I intended, and what the ſcope and occaſion of the Article requires. When therefore I ſay, that the Quakers repreſent this Light within as a ſort of *Extraordinary* Inſpiration, 'tis plain from the Antitheſis of the Article that my meaning is, that they repreſent it as a Supernatural Gift or Grace, meaning by *Supernatural* not only ſomething beſide, above or beyond the *Nature* of Man; (for ſo alſo upon my Principle 'tis acknowledged to be *Supernatural*, becauſe I expreſly make it to be the very Eſſence of God) but ſomething above or beyond the common *Order*, *State* or *Condition* of Human Nature. Supernatural not only as to the *Subſtance* of it, (for that's confeſs'd on both Hands, only more exalted upon my Hypotheſis than upon theirs) but alſo as to its *Diſpenſation* and Order, being ſuch an extraordinary ſuperabundant Addition to the Nature of Man, as is not neceſſary he ſhould always have, and without which he would ſtill continue a rational and intelligent Nature. In oppoſition to which I ſaid, that 'tis a Man's Natural and Ordinary way of Underſtanding, that is, that 'tis ſo far from being ſuch an extraordinary Superaddition to Human Nature, as

Man

Man might be without, and yet be a reasonable Creature; that 'tis so much the Natural and Ordinary way of his Understanding, that he could not be able to understand at all without it: That he would not only have less Light should it be taken from him, but be quite in the Dark. In one Word, that 'tis not a thing of *Advantage only*, but of *Necessity*, necessary to the very Being, as well as to the well or better Being of a reasonable understanding Spirit as such, who without this Light would not only not see so well, but would be able to see nothing, or not at all. This is the plain obvious Sense of my Words, only drawn out more at length, whereby it appears that my Notion differs considerably from that of the Quakers in this particular also.

And now if this be the Sense of my Proposition, (as 'tis plain that 'tis, it being not capable of any other) I may easily answer Mr. *Vickris* his Question, that demands of me, Where I learnt that the Quakers represent this Light within as a sort of extraordinary Inspiration? For 'tis very plain that they make this Internal Light to be *Grace*, that special and peculiar Grace of Christ whereby

whereby he reſtores laps'd Man from the Corruption of his Natural State. *Apolgy*, p. 330. *For this end*, ſays Mr. *Barclay*, (that is, for the Reſtoration of Man) *God hath communicated and given unto every man a meaſure of the Light of his Son, a meaſure of Grace, or a meaſure of the Spirit*, &c. And again he calls it expreſly a Page 346. *Supernatural Gift and Grace of Chriſt*. Not that I would be thought to deny the Divine Light to be *Grace* as to certain *Degrees* of it. So far from that, that I think it to be the greateſt Grace of God, that is, with reſpect to the Degrees of it, many of which I allow to be ſuch extraordinary Superadditions to the common Order or State of Human Nature, as Man might ſimply be without, and yet continue in the Rank and Form of a reaſonable and intelligent Creature. But not content with this, the Quakers make the Divine Light to be Grace ſimply and abſolutely, as to its whole Nature and Kind, ſo as to be all over *extraordinary*. And if ſo, then they are ſo far from making it (as I do) neceſſary to a Man's Natural and Ordinary way of Underſtanding, that they muſt make it ſuch a Superabundant Acceſſion to the common Condition of Man's Nature, as without

out which he would ſtill underſtand enough to denominate him a Rational Being. For certainly a Man may underſtand without *Grace*.

But that my Adverſary may not pretend that I lay the whole ſtreſs of this matter upon a *Conſequence*, (tho it be a very plain one) I will prove the ſame by expreſs Teſtimony, namely, That the Quakers do make their Light to be according to the before-ſtated Senſe of the Word, ſomething extraordinary, ſomething added to the common way of Underſtanding, ſo as not to be ſimply neceſſary to Underſtanding in general, but only to the greater Advantage of it. For ſays Mr. *Barclay*, *That Man, as he is a Rational Creature, hath Reaſon, as a Natural Faculty of his Soul, by which he can diſcern things that are rational, we deny not. For this is a Property Natural and Eſſential to him, by which he can know and learn many Arts and Sciences, beyond what any other Animal can do by the meer Animal Principle.* So that here the Light is not ſimply and ordinarily neceſſary to the underſtanding of things, which it ſeems may be done by Reaſon alone without the Light. To the ſame purpoſe again, ſays the ſame Author, *Man*

Apology, p. 337.

Page 346. *Man in his Natural State* (that is, in the ſtate devoid of this Light, which he had juſt before call'd the ſtate of Darkneſs) *can eaſily comprehend, and doth comprehend, thoſe things that are peculiar and common to him, as ſuch.* And tho they commonly call the natural ſtate of Man (when without the Senſation of this Light) a ſtate of Darkneſs, yet 'tis not becauſe they ſuppoſe him to be abſolutely dark, and to know nothing, but only dark as to Spiritual and Saving Truths. So that according to them there may be Knowledge and Underſtanding without the Divine Light, which therefore they muſt be ſuppoſed to look upon as an extraordinary Acceſſion, and not as an ordinary Requiſite to Human Underſtanding. Which again ſets their Principle at a ſufficient Diſtance from mine. Tho I muſt needs do them ſo much Juſtice as to confeſs, that herein they ſpeak as agreeably to their Principle as I do to mine: For conceiving their Light not as the very Object of Human Underſtanding, not as that Truth it ſelf which we perceive, (as is plain, becauſe they do not make it the Eſſence of God, as was noted above) but as ſomething that ſerves for the clearer Revelation or Diſcovery

Diſcovery of that Object, that is in one Word, conceiving it rather as a more advantagious *Medium*, than as an *Object*, they might well be excuſed from making it ſimply and abſolutely neceſſary to Underſtanding; Whereas I conceiving the Divine Light to be the Omniform Eſſence of God, and accordingly making it to be the very immediate Object of my Underſtanding, that very Truth *which* (not that Medium *by which*) I contemplate, was obliged to ſuppoſe it ſo neceſſary to the common and natural way of Underſtanding, that there could be no ſuch thing as Underſtanding without it; which I am ſure a Quaker will not, or at leaſt upon his Principles, can never ſay.

And thus far the Difference between us is very clear and plain, and would indeed be on all ſides unexceptionable, but that Mr. *Vickris* has here ſpied out ſomething, (for which I very much admire the Quickneſs of his Eye-ſight) and that is a *Contradiction*. *Before* (ſays he) *it was a Divine Communication and Manifeſtation only, and now an extraordinary Inſpiration. Is not Extraordinary more than Common, or Communication*

and Manifestation only? And this he takes for a Contradiction of what was laid down in the First Article. But methinks Mr. *Vickris* should not undertake to write *Controversie*, unless he had known better how to judge of a Contradiction. For does it follow, that because I first say, that the Quakers represent their Light as a Divine Communication or Manifestation only, in opposition to its being the very Essence or Substance of God, and afterwards add (as another Step or Degree of Difference) that they represent it as an *Extraordinary* one, in opposition to the Natural and Ordinary way of Understanding; I say, Does it hence appear that I contradict my self? What if Extraordinary be more than Common, or Communication or Manifestation only, does it therefore *Contradict* it? What, is every Addition a Contradiction? It may indeed be so, in case the Degree added in the Second Proposition were denied or excluded in the first. But is this the present Case? Tho Extraordinary Communication be more than bare Communication simply consider'd, is it therefore denied by it? Is it not plain that this is only an Abstraction, and not any Negation? For if he should take

hold

hold of the Term (*only*), where I suppose his Mistake lay, is it not very plain that the Term (*only*) in the First Article is not exclusive of *Extraordinary*, which is added in the Second, but only of the Divine Essence or Substance; this being the Sense of the Proposition, that they represent their Light not as the very Essence of God, but only as something communicated by God? And where then is there any appearance of a Contradiction? But lest Mr. *Vickris* should not take this, (for he has now given me just occasion to question his Capacity) I will illustrate it by an Instance: Suppose a *Cartesian* should say first, That Light is *only* the *Endeavour* of the Globules of the Second Element to Motion, not the Motion its self; and then afterwards should further say, that 'tis the Endeavour of those Globules to recede from the Center of the Luminous Body in a Right Line, would one of these Propositions contradict the other? 'Tis more than I can find if they do. But he continues his Exception upon this part, asking me, *Have not the Quakers declared the Light to be Universal, as well as Divine, in its Gift and Manifestation to the Sons of Men?* Well, what

if they have, may they not also notwithstanding that hold it to be an *Extraordinary* Gift, according to the above-stated Sense of the Word Extraordinary, as it signifies something superadded to the Natural way of Man's Understanding? Does Extraordinary in this Sense import any thing inconsistent with *Universal*? Suppose *Adam* had persevered in his Original State, and his whole Posterity had inherited that extraordinary Grace, that *Donum Justitiæ*, which (according to some) was superadded to the Essential Perfection of his Human Nature, would it have been the less Extraordinary, that is, the less a Superaddition to the Nature of Man, because Universal? Sure Mr. *Vickris* must be but little acquainted with the Nature of *Opposition*, if he thinks there is any between these two things. But suppose there were, he himself is accountable for it, and not I. For I have brought Evidence enough to prove, that they do make their Light to be (as I have explained it) *Extraordinary*, and if that be inconsistent with their other Notion of its Universality, the Inconsistency lights upon themselves, and I can't help that.

And

And thus the Former Part of this Section is sufficiently vindicated; but it seems there is a Flaw in the Latter, which Mr. *Vickris* endeavours to make great Advantage of, tho it be such as is plainly owing to the Captiousness and Uncandidness of his own Construction. *Again,* (says he) *in the same Section thou sayest, I suppose it,* viz. *The Light within to be a Man's Natural and Ordinary way of Understanding. And just before thou madest it to be the very Essence and Substance of the Deity,* &c. Did I so? Then this one would think should have been a Key to my Meaning to any one that was not resolv'd to misunderstand and pervert it, that he might have something to expose and harangue upon. For is it in the least to be imagin'd, or does Mr. *Vickris* in his Conscience seriously think that I, who in this very Book, and in these very Articles he reflects upon, as well as in the whole Course of my other Writings upon this occasion, do all along earnestly contend, that this Internal Light is no other than the very Essence and Substance of God, whose Omniformity is exhibitive of all things, and is the immediate Object of our Conception, that very Truth which

we conceive: And that I who make this the ground of Difference between my Principle of the Light and that of the Quakers, that they do not make it the Subſtance of God, but only ſomething communicated by or from him, whereas I expreſly do: I ſay, can it be imagin'd that after all this, I ſhould ſo far forget my ſelf, as to make this Divine Light to be the very ſame thing with Human Underſtanding, and ſo confound (as he pretends) the Divine λόγος, with Man's Reaſon and Conſcience? Sure I ſhould be fitter to pick Straws in *Bedlam*, than to write Books, ſhould I be ſo ſenſeleſs as to make Truth and Underſtanding, Object and Faculty, God and Creature all one. But as this is too groſs to be my real Meaning, ſo the Scope and Antitheſis of the Article do plainly ſhew that it was not. 'Tis plain from thence (and no candid Reader would have underſtood me otherwiſe) that my Meaning, tho for Brevity's ſake not ſo explicitly worded, was no other than what has been already ſuggeſted, *viz.* That whereas the Quakers repreſent their Light as ſomething extraordinarily ſuperadded to the natural way of Underſtanding, (as ſuppoſing two diſtinct Lights in the Soul) and ſo

not

not absolutely necessary to Understanding as such, which according to them may be without it: I on the contrary making but one way of Understanding in all, suppose this Light to be so far from being such an Extraordinary Superaddition, that 'tis so requisite to the Natural and Ordinary way of Understanding, that there is no Understanding without it. And so when I say, *pag.* 77. *This is Reason, this is Conscience*, 'tis plain enough that I mean no more than that this (namely the Light) is that whereby I perform Acts of Reason and Acts of Conscience; not that it is my very reasoning Faculty, but that whereby I reason and discourse, as furnishing me with Idea's for my Contemplation. And if this be the Natural and Necessary Sense of my Words (as I believe Mr. *Vickris* must needs be sensible that it is) then his whole following Harangue about my confounding the Divine Λόγος with Man's Natural Reason and Conscience is quite spoil'd, and from a piece of Rhetoric becomes a most trifling Impertinence, (or to borrow a Stroke of Oratory from him) *Insignificant, and like an Arrow shot at Random.*

Exception against the Third Article.

IN thy Third Section thou com'ſt in with a *Salvo Errore*. If I miſtake not, the Quakers confine their Light within to ſome certain Objects, namely, Moral and Spiritual Truths in Order only to the Direction of Practice. How ſhouldſt thou do otherwiſe but miſtake the Principles of others, ſeeing thou art ſo confuſed about thine own? However, I muſt tell thee it is no ſmall Fault at ſuch an Uncertainty to expoſe Peoples Principles; and 'tis an Abuſe to ſay, that the Quakers confine the Light within. It is Divine, Supernatural, and Uncircumſcribable; in it are hid all the Treaſures of Wiſdom and Knowledg. Where have the Quakers taught otherwiſe? Have they not teſtified and declared the Light and the Spirit of Truth are one and the ſame in being, which will guide *into all Truth*, John 16. 13. The Quakers believe this Divine Light to be the Quickner of their Underſtandings to Know, and of their Wills to Love and Practiſe all Truth, and that it aſſiſts the Natural Faculties of the Soul in the Attainment of neceſſary Arts and Sciences, as well

as

as capacitates it to Know and Practiſe Moral and Spiritual Truths. Thou may'ſt read what the Author to the Book of Wiſdom ſays on this Subject, in the 9th and 10th Chapters.

And whereas thou ſayſt, the Quakers make the Light within a Supplement to Scripture, which they ſay is not ſufficient without it, nor indeed any more than a meer dead Letter. I anſwer, Theſe Words *Supplement to Scripture* are thy own, not ours; and this ſeems to be a Compoſition of thy own Notion of the Quakers Faith concerning the Holy Scripture, without any Quotation of their Words or Writings; and as 'tis an Objection is built upon thy miſtake in thy former Section, *viz. The Quakers repreſent this Light within as a ſort of extraordinary Inſpiration.* Which hath been already Anſwer'd, proving the Univerſality of the Divine Light in Man; which conſider'd, there is no juſt Cauſe for this as an Objection againſt the Quakers aſſigning the Scriptures to be inſufficient without the Light, becauſe the Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures cannot occur to the Underſtanding without it, and the Formal Reaſon thereof is its Preſence and Manifeſtation. The

Quakers

Quakers believe that Christ Jesus by his Divine Light within, doth in these Days, as in the Days of his Flesh, expound, fulfil, and open to the True Believers the Holy Scriptures, which according to the Apostles Exhortation to *Timothy*, *Chap.* 2. 3,15. are able to make wise unto Salvation, (Note) *through Faith which is in Christ Jesus.* The Word *Supplement* in this Sense, I hope, will be found no Error, but according to thy Construction of the Quakers representing the Light within as a sort of Extraordinary Inspiration, *Sect.* 2. or special Priviledg of a certain Order of Men, their own Party, as in *Sect.* 4. And then making them to say the Scriptures with relation only to the Direction of Practice, (as thy Lines import, *Sect.* 3.) are not sufficient without it, nor indeed any more than a meer dead Letter, is to render the Quakers not only singular and erroneous in their Principle of the Light (which shall be more duly observ'd in its place) but also contemptuous of the Holy Scriptures as useless and insufficient to all but themselves, which is a great and hainous Abuse of a Society of People, without Cause and Provocation, and contrary to their Public and Known Assertions both by Word

Word and Writing, who believe according to the ſame Apoſtle to *Timothy*, *Cap.* 2. 3, 16, 17. that *all Scripture*, &c. And this ſhall ſuffice for an Anſwer to thy Third Section.

The Anſwer.

IF I deliver'd my ſelf with more than ordinary Caution and Reſervedneſs in this Article, it was becauſe of my abundant Concern, leſt I ſhould injure thoſe whom I was repreſenting by a falſe Charge; tho I think it is too much for Mr. *Vickris* to condemn me for miſrepreſenting them, and yet to upbraid me with my *Tenderneſs* in doing ſo at the ſame Time. But I find upon further Examination that I needed not to proceed with ſuch Suſpenſe in this matmatter, being ſo fully aſſured of my being in the right here, as well as in the other parts of my Account, that had I the Liberty to *New-Caſt* this Article again, it ſhould be in the very ſame *Mould*. Mr. *Vickris* indeed tells me that *'tis an Abuſe to ſay the Quakers confine the Light within*. And I tell him again, that 'tis an abuſe in him to ſay, that this is my Charge. I never ſaid abſolutely and ſimply that they confine

fine the Light within, (which would imply a Confinement to Persons) but that they confine it to some certain Objects, namely, Moral and Spiritual Truths, in order only to the Direction of Practice. And that they do thus *confine* the Light is as plain and certain as that they *hold* it, if Mr. *Barclay* may be allow'd to understand their Principles. For says he, *As God gave two great Lights to rule the outward World, the Sun and Moon, the greater Light to Rule the Day, and the lesser Light to rule the Night; So hath he given Man the Light of his Son, a Spiritual Divine Light to rule him in the things Spiritual, and the Light of Reason to rule him in things Natural.* Here it is very plain, First, That he supposes two distinct Lights in the Soul, the Divine Light, and the Light of Reason, or the Natural Light, which by the way sufficiently confirms what was said in the last Section concerning their making the Divine Light an *Extraordinary* Communication, that is, *Superaccessory* to the Natural Light, or Man's Natural and Ordinary way of Understanding, which might remain intire and unextinguisht, tho separated from the Divine Light, as being a Principle wholly distinct from

Apology, p. 337.

from it, and that ſtands upon another Bottom. Contrary to what I contend for, namely, That there is but one Light in the Soul of Man, which is the Divine Light, wherein we ſee and perceive all things, and by which we naturally and ordinarily underſtand. 'Tis alſo very plain in the 2d place, That as he ſuppoſes two diſtinct Lights in the Soul, the Divine and the Natural, ſo he aſſigns them two diſtinct Offices, no leſs diſtinct than Day and Night, the Divine Light being to direct in things Spiritual as the Sun rules the Day; and the Natural Light being to direct in things Natural, as the Moon governs the Night. Each of 'em ſeems has its proper Orb and Provinces, and they can no more interfere with one another's Order, than the Sun can uſurp the Government of the Night, or the Moon aſſume to her ſelf the Conduct of the Day. And if this be not to confine the Divine Light to ſome certain Objects, namely, to Moral and Spiritual Truths, I know not what is. 'Tis confined as much to ſuch Objects as the Sun is confined to the Day, and I deſire no more, thinking that to be Confinement enough. If Mr. *Vickris* had been but half ſo much *confin'd* to Civility and

Good

Good Behaviour, he would have treated me with more Humanity and Courteſie than he has done in ſome parts of his Book.

I might be more liberal of Quotations upon this occaſion, if I thought there were any need; but ſince that already produc'd is ſo expreſs to the purpoſe, I ſhall only take notice of a remarkable Paſſage in the Preface to Mr. *Barclay*'s Works, lately Printed in Folio, where the Ingenious Author giving an Account of his Apology for the true Chriſtian Divinity, makes one himſelf for the Scholaſtic manner and way of its Compoſition, which it ſeems was in Tenderneſs to Scholars, and in Condeſcenſion to their Education: His Words are, *The Method and Style of the Book may be ſomewhat Singular, and like a Scholar; for we make that ſort of Learning no part of our Divine Science*, &c. Where 'tis plain, that by *that ſort of Learning*, he means Human Learning, thoſe Arts and Sciences which are the common Objects of our Academical Studies. And that by *our Divine Science* he means that Knowledg which is ſupernaturally communicated to them by the ſaving Light of Chriſt,

Page 21.

whereof

whereof he had discours'd before. So that when he says we make that sort of Learning no part of our Divine Science, it comes to as much as if he had said, *We make Human Learning, or those Arts and Sciences which are the common Objects of Academical Study, to be no part of that Knowledg which is supernaturally communicated to us by the Light of Christ.* And if Human Learning be no part of that Knowledg which comes by the Divine Light, then the Divine Light is not extended to Human Learning, and consequently must be confined to Spiritual Truths, the very Province which Mr *Barclay* had assign'd it before.

And to this Supposition the Thread of their former Principle naturally leads them. For supposing the Divine Light to be an Extraordinary Communication of God, that is, something superadded to the Natural and Ordinary way of Understanding, there is all the reason in the World that they should assign to it Divine and Spiritual Objects as its proper Sphere and Province, since Natural things were before sufficiently discernible by a Natural Light and Principle. Especially considering that this Divine Light is also conceiv'd and repre-

represented by them as that very *Grace* of Christ whereby Men are Converted and Saved, and which was given to them by God for that very purpose. For
Page 317. so Mr. *Barclay* in his 5th and 6th Propositions, reckoning up the Ends and Purposes for which the saving and spiritual Light (as he calls it) was given by God, makes them to consist in making manifest all things that are reprovable, in teaching all Temperance, Righteousness and Godliness, and (in general) in Lightning the Hearts of all in order to Salvation. So then it seems this Light is purely *in order to Salvation*, and consequently ought to be confined to the things that concern it, that is, to Divine and Spiritual Truths in order to the Direction of Life and Manners. Herein therefore they are consonant to their Principles: As they *do* thus confine their Light to Spiritual things, so they *ought* thus to confine it. For what has *Grace* to do with the things of *Nature*? And as *they* follow *their* Principle, so *I* follow *mine*. For not conceiving this Internal Light as any thing superadded to the ordinary way of Man's Understanding, but as that whereby he naturally and ordinarily Understands, and not conceiving it after the manner

manner of Grace neither (I mean as to its simple Kind, tho I allow it may have that Estimation in some of its Degrees) but rather as according to the Natural Order of Human Understanding: I had no reason to confine it (as the Quakers do) to Divine and Spiritual Truths, but to extend it to all Truth without Exception, which I suppose to be equally perceivable in this Divine Light, which, as being the very Essence of God, must be equally exhibitive of all.

But Mr. *Vickris* will still have it an *Abuse* to say, that the Quakers confine the Light within. For, says he, *It is Divine, Supernatural, and Uncircumscribable, and in it are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge.* Alluding, I suppose, to that of the Apostle concerning Christ, Col. 2. 3. But tho they do make it to be Divine and Supernatural, yet I do not see how they can make it, or he can call it, *Uncircumscribable*, since (as has been observ'd in the preceeding Pages) they do not make it to be the proper Essence or Substance of God, but a certain middle Nature between God and Man: And for the same reason he cuts himself

off from all Pretence to that Text concerning the *Divine Word*, that in him are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge, which indeed is very applicable, and carries a very apposite and emphatic Sense upon my Hypothesis, who make the Divine Light within to be the very Divine Ar[illegible] himself, the Substantial and Essential Wisdom of God; but must be altogether *abrupt* upon his, who either does, or by the Principles of Quakerism is obliged to make it not the very Essence of the Deity, but something of a middle Nature.

But says he, *Have they not testified and declared the Light and the Spirit of Truth are all one and the same Being, which will guide into all Truth?* John 16. 13. And I do not at present well remember whether they have or no, nor shall I give my self the Trouble to enquire, thinking it altogether impertinent. But sure I am, that they have often *testify'd* and *declar'd* that the Light is not the proper Essence of God, but a certain middle Being between God and Man; and if they will afterwards testify and declare that 'tis the very same with the Spirit of Truth (which is really and truly

truly God) I think they will evidently testifie against themselves, and declare Contradictions, and then 'tis no great matter what thy *testifie* or *declare*. But besides, suppose they did make the Light to be one and the same with the Spirit of Truth, which according to that of St. *John*, will guide into all Truth; yet 'tis plain from the foregoing Measures that they *must*, and from the Context of the place, that they *ought* to mean it only of Spiritual, Saving and necessary Truths, which may very well consist with their supposed Confinement of the Light.

But how can this be so confined, when Mr. *Firbris* testifies again, and declares that *the Divine Light does assist the Natural Faculties of the Soul in the Attainment of Arts and Sciences?* But how is this consistent with what he says in the Beginning of his Book, where he calls this Corrupt Wisdom, and the Forbidden Fruit, and what will prove Folly in the End, and the Wisdom that is Below, and that which God's Wisdom from Above ever did and will confound? See the Inconsistency and Unsincerity of this Writer! When it would serve his turn to disparage and

Page 6, 7.

down Human Learning, then 'tis Corrupt Wisdom, Forbidden Fruit, and I know not what. And when he had another turn to serve, (that is, to contradict me) then this Wisdom, as corrupt as it is, is taught us by the Instruction of the Divine Light. But stay, Sir, tho this Divine Light be not as you say the very Essence of God, yet is it so far divided against him, as to teach what is contrary to him, and what his Wisdom ever did and will confound? Are the *Divine Light* and the *Divine Wisdom* at such Defiance with each other? But 'tis Mr. *Vicks* is that is at Defiance with himself, and I am afraid will not easily be reconciled. For if the Divine Light teaches this sort of Wisdom, then 'tis not Corrupt, which contradicts what he said in the *other* place; and if this sort of Wisdom be Corrupt, then the Divine Light does not teach it, (as being a Pure and Clean Principle, and such as *cannot consent to any Evil or Wickedness*) which contradicts what he says *here*. So that either way Contradiction is his Doom.

Apology, p. 338.

As to what I said concerning the Quakers making the Light within a *Supplement to Scripture*, &c. it was not intended

intended as a direct and particular Objection against them, of it self, but only to confirm the other, wherein they are charged with confining it to Moral and Spiritual Truths in order to the Direction of Practice. For that being the acknowledged End and Use of Scripture, it seems an high Presumption, that what is made a Supplement to the Scripture, is also intended for the very same End and Use. And therefore Mr. *Vickris* need not have opposed himself against this as a direct and particular Objection, it being not by me either intended or used as such. For whatever my Thoughts may be concerning the Sufficiency or Insufficiency of the Scripture without the inward Light, I had no occasion then, nor have any Mind at present to engage in a Dispute about that matter. Only I would desire Mr. *Vickris* and his Brethren by the way to consider, whether they can answer that Argument of *Episcopius*, whereby he proves the Vanity and Absurdity of the *Spiritualists*, (as he calls them) in making the *Inward Word* the Interpreter of Scripture. *Either* (says he) *they will have that inward Word, as they call it, to have an intelligible Sense in it, or not to have an intelligible Sense. If they will* Institut. Theolog. Pag. 253.

have it to contain an intelligible Sense, then they must grant that that Sense being perceiv'd by the Understanding may be pronounc'd and expres'd by outward Speech. And if so, then it follows that this Sense may also be written, since whatever is pronounc'd by the Mouth, may also be expres'd in writing. But then this written Sense will again be nothing else than an external Word, which being expres't in Letters will according to them be nothing else but an inky Letter or Scripture, which they deny to be sufficient. But if they will have this inward Word to have in it no intelligible Sense, or that may be pronounc'd, or written, then it will necessarily follow, that this their Word is no Word, or only a vain and foolish Word. For such must that Word be which has no Intelligible Sense. If they say, that this Word is not perceiv'd but by him upon whom it is immediately impres'd by God. Then I say again, Either it is impres'd without any intelligible Sense, or with it. If without any, then the same Difficulty will return, viz. That tis a vain and foolish Word. But if it be imprinted with intelligible Sense, then what hinders but that it may be expressed and written? And then how will it differ from that written Word we have hitherto treated of?

But

But he tells me that these Words, *Supplement to Scripture*, are my own, not theirs. It may be so, I will not stand with Mr. *Vickris* for a Word, since he is so kind to me as to acknowledg all that I intended by it, namely, That the Light is the Interpreter of Scripture, and that the Scripture is not sufficient without it; without denying that 'tis not any thing more than a meer dead Letter, a Phrase usually applied by the Quakers to the Scripture consider'd in its self, as unaccompany'd with the Testimony of the Internal Light. For the further clearing of which Notion, when any of them write next, I would desire them to take the Argument of the before-mention'd *Learned Objector* in their way.

He tells me again that this, as 'tis an Objection, is built upon my Mistake in my former Section, *viz.* That the Quakers represent this Light within as a sort of Extraordinary Inspiration, which he says has been answer'd already in proving the *Universality* of the Divine Light. But I answer, First, That this was not intended as a particular Objection of its self, but only to second and

inforce another. Secondly, That if it be an Objection, it is not built upon what he ſuppoſes, which is only a miſtake of his own concerning my meaning by the Word *Extraordinary*, which becauſe by me not oppoſed to Univerſal, cannot be ſaid to be any way anſwer'd by his proving the Univerſality of the Divine Light. Then as to what he ſays afterwards concerning my rendring the Quakers contemptuous of Holy Scripture, as uſeleſs to all but themſelves, in regard that 'tis held as a dead Letter without the Light, which Light according to my Conſtruction of their Principle, is an Extraordinary Inſpiration, and a ſpecial Priviledg of a certain Order of Men, their own Party. I anſwer, That indeed the Scripture would be made uſeleſs to all but themſelves upon this double Suppoſition. 1. That 'tis a dead Letter without the Light. And, 2. That this Light is their own peculiar Priviledg; but then this latter (upon which the Strength of the Objection turns) was not abſolutely charged upon them by me. For as for the Term *Extraordinary*, it has been more than once noted, that it was not uſed in a Senſe oppoſite to *Univerſal*. And as for their making

making the Light a Special Priviledg of a certain Order of Men, that this is not to be understood in such a Sense as will lay any Ground for my Adversary's Complaint, will sufficiently appear, when I come to consider his Exception against the Fourth Article, to the Examination of which I now proceed.

Exception against the Fourth Article.

THE Fourth is a down-right Falsity, *viz.* The Quakers make their Light within a Special Priviledg of a certain Order of Men, their own Party. Not indeed as to the Possibility, yet they do as to the Act, making none but those of their own way to be actually enlightned by it. This is so abundantly confuted by the Writings in general of those People, more particularly in the afore-recited Book of *Robert Barclay's*, which considering thou hast read, I am the more amazed at thy Assertion. They say all are actually enlightned by it, all are call'd, but all have not obeyed, according to those Scriptures, *Micah* 6. 8. *He hath shewed thee, O Man, what is good,* &c. 1 *John* 9. 3, 19. 1 *Cor.* 13. 17. *Tit.* 2. 11. &c. Thy Distinction of a Possibility, and not

not actually with respect to the Divine Illumination of this Principle is trivial, tho not with respect to Salvation by it. The Capacity or Possibility is not, nor can be in Man abstract from the actual illuminating Power and Spirit, no more than seeing, if the Light be not separate from the Eye. The Quakers have, and still do declare, that Christ Jesus, the Light of the World, is the Universal Free Gift of God, for the Benefit of all Men, in order to their Salvation. And is not this Common, yet Special Priviledg, because dearly purchas'd and freely bestow'd on lost Man? That thou may'st not want occasion to traduce the Quakers, thou hast so much over-done it in this Section, as to contradict thy self in the Fifth. As for Instance, Sect. 4. to be actually enlightned according to thy Principle is no special Priviledg, but the common and universal Benefit of all Men, yea, of all the Intelligent Creation, who all see and understand in this Light of God, without which there would be neither Truth nor Understanding. On the contrary, Sect. 5. thou say'st, thy Light does not Formally enlighten or instruct thee, but when thou carefully attends to and consults it, and read what is written in those

Divine

Divine Ideal Characters. The like Doctrin thou hast, *Pag.* 71. of thy Book, Sect. 5. and 6. where, treating of thy double Illumination of the Divine λόγος, *viz.* Fundamentally and Potentially, or else Effectually or Actually; in the former Sense (thou say'st) he enlightens every Man; in the latter, only those who duly consult him and attend to him. See what Contradiction thy strain'd Notions run thee into? One while to be actually enlightned, is the Common and Universal Benefit of all Men; another while only of those who consult it and attend to it, and all to avoid being thought to Symbolize with the Quakers in thy Notion of the Divine Light. Thy Distinction of Potentially and Actually can have no more in it than the Difference in the Subject, the one Universal Act of the Word or Light enlightning every Man, comprehends both. These are but new-invented Terms to express the most ancient, and more Divinely, and better reveal'd Truths of the Gospel.

The

The Answer.

THIS Exception seems to have in it the most of Subtilty and Artifice, and to be the most fair and plausible of any: But I make no great Question but that it will have as fair and clear an Answer as any of the rest. And because a Question well stated, and put in a good Light, is half resolv'd, I shall first of all define the Sense and Meaning of my own Words in this Fourth Article, that so it may appear what it is that I there affirm, and what he does or should deny, and wherein the Point of the Question between us lies. Now when I say that the Quakers make their Light within a special Priviledg of a certain Order of Men, 'tis plain, First, in general, from the Article its self, that I do not mean as to the *Capacity* or *Possibility*, but as to the *Act*. For I grant as to the *Possibility*, that they suppose all Men to be indifferently capable of the Divine Illumination, as appears from their contending against the Doctrin of Absolute Reprobation, and for Universal Grace. I do not therefore make them to confine the Light as to the Possibility, but only as

as to the Act. And then as to the Act (in which respect alone I say they confine it) it is also very plain, that I mean not the Act of *Having* or *Possessing* the Light (for I know very well that 'tis one of their Fundamental Tenets, that God has Communicated and given unto every Man a Measure of the Light of his Son, a Measure of Grace, or a Measure of the Spirit, as Mr. *Barclay* expresses it) but the Act of being *enlightned* by it. And that this is my Meaning, the Tenor of my Words do sufficiently shew, because I there say, *Tho they do not make it a special Privilege as to the Possibility, yet they do as to the Act, making none but those of their own way to be actually enlightned by it.* Where by Act it is plain that I mean not the Act of *Possession*, but the Act of *Illumination*. For Mr. *Vickris* is to consider, that 'tis one thing to have or to possess the Light, and another thing to be actually enlightned by it. And they who very zealously contend for the Universality of the former, may at the same time, and that without any Inconsistency, confine the Latter. Which is the thing that I affirm the Quakers do, *viz.* That tho they do not confine the Light either as to the Possibility

Apology, P. 330.

of being enlightned by it, or as to the Act of having or poſſeſſing it, yet they do confine it as to the Act of Illumination. That they do thus confine it, I will firſt ſhew, and then conſider what he alledges to the contrary, which I think is a fair and diſtinct way of Proceeding.

That the Quakers do confine the Light as to the Act of Illumination to certain Men, or to Men of a certain Order, I think will be readily granted me, if I can ſhew that they do thus confine it to the *Regenerate*. And that they do ſo, I believe I can not only render exceeding Probable, but even *Demonſtrate*; which I undertake to do in this Form of Argument:

They that do exclude all Men that are in their Natural and Corrupt Eſtate from the actual Illumination of the Divine Light, do confine the Divine Light as to the Act of Illumination to the Regenerate.

But the Quakers do exclude all Men that are in their Natural and Corrupt Eſtate from the Actual Illumination of the Divine Light.

There-

Therefore the Quakers do confine the Divine Light unto the Act of Illumination to the Regenerate.

The first of these Propositions is most evident. The Second I prove thus:

They that do exclude all Men that are in their Natural and Corrupt Estate from any Sensation or Feeling of the Divine Light, they do exclude all Men that are in their Natural Corrupt Estate from the Actual Illumination of the Divine Light.

But the Quakers do exclude all Men that are in their Natural and Corrupt Estate from any Sensation or Feeling of the Divine Light.

Therefore the Quakers do exclude all Men that are in their Natural Corrupt Estate from the Actual Illumination of the Divine Light.

The First of these Propositions is again most evident. And for the Proof of the Second, which alone requires it, I appeal to the Testimony of their most

Authentic

Authentic Writer Mr. *Barclay*, who in his Fourth Proposition speaking concerning the Natural Condition of Man, gives this express Account of it, that he is not only fall'n, degenerated and dead, but *deprived of the Sense or Feeling of this Inward Testimony, or Seed of God. And is subject to the Power, Nature and Seed of the Serpent, which he sows in Men's Hearts, while they abide in this Natural and Corrupted Estate. From whence it comes, that not only their Words and Deeds, but all their Imaginations are Evil perpetually in the sight of God, as proceeding from this depraved and wicked Seed. Man therefore as he is in this state can know nothing aright; yea, his Thoughts and Conceptions concerning God and Things Spiritual (until he be disjoyn'd from the evil Seed, and united to the Divine Light) are unprofitable both to himself and others.* Thus Mr. *Barclay*. Now how far Man in his Natural and Corrupt Estate may be capable of conceiving rightly, either of God, or of Divine things, it is not my present Business to enquire or dispute. But what I observe from these Words of Mr. *Barclay* is this, That Natural Men, or Men in their Natural and Corrupt Estate, however they may have the

Apology, p. 310.

Divine

Divine Light in them Seminally or Radically, yet they have not (while in that state) any Senſation or any Feeling of it. They are his own expreſs Words. And if they have not any Senſation or Feeling of the Light, then they are not actually enlightned by it, which agrees with the Diſtinction before laid down, that tho they have the Light as to the Act of Poſſeſſion, yet they have it not as to the Act of Illumination. And if all Natural Men are excluded from the actual Illumination of the Divine Light, then 'tis plain that the Divine Light as to the Act of Illumination, (tho not as to the Act of Poſſeſſion) is confined to the Regenerate. Which was the Propoſition I undertook to prove.

And that all Natural and Unregenerate Men, tho they have the Divine Light lodg'd in them, are yet ſuppoſed to be deprived of all actual Illumination by it, may be fairly collected from another remarkable place in Mr. *Barclay*, where he uſes this as an Argument to prove, that the Light is a Subſtance not an Accident, becauſe it may be in the Heart of wicked Men without denominating them, that is, as appears

by the Tenor of his Discourse, without affecting them, or deriving any Influence or Vertue upon them. His Words are these, *We know it to be a Substance, because it subsists in the Hearts of Wicked Men, even while they are in their Wickedness. Now no Accident can be in a Subject, without it gives the Subject its own Denomination; as where Whiteness is in a Subject, there the Subject is call'd White. So we distinguish betwixt Holiness, as 'tis an Accident, which denominates Man so, as the Seed receives a place in him; and betwixt this Holy Substantial Seed, which many times lies in Man's Heart as a naked Grain in a Stony Ground. So also, as we may distinguish betwixt Health and Medicine. Health cannot be in the Body, without the Body be called Healthful. Because Health is an Accident. But Medicine may be in a Body that is most unhealthful, for that it is a Substance.* In which Words Mr. *Barclay* does, as far as I can judg, plainly imply, that wicked Men, tho they have the Light really and truly in them, as well as those that are good, yet they are not actually enlightned by it. It is indeed in their Hearts, but it lies dormant there like hot Embers cover'd up under the Ashes, without affecting, or denominating, or enlightning them. For it seems, it lies in them as a naked Grain in a Stony Ground, and as Physic in a Body that is not at all wrought upon by it; that is, it lies there, and that's all. Which amounts to as much as if he had said in the Words of the before-mention'd Distinction, that they have it indeed as to the Act of Possession, but not as to the Act of Illumination.

Apology, p. 334.

Which

Which must therefore be confined to good Men only, or to the Regenerate.

To this purpose I might cite many other Passages which occur up and down in the Writings of Mr. *Barclay*, as when he says (as he does frequently) that the Divine Light or Seed lies in wicked Men, *hurt, bruised, wounded, slain,* yea, and *buried.* And when he says that in *this Seed in the Hearts of all Men is the Kingdom of God, as in Capacity to be produced, or rather exhibited, according as it receives Depth, is nourish'd and not choaked.* And when he says that this Seed was in the Pharisees, as a Seed lying in a Barren Ground, which springs not forth, &c. But I forbear more Quotations, having I think already produced enough to make it plain and out of Question that they do exclude all wicked Men from the actual Illumination, tho not from the actual Possession of the Divine Light, or which is all one, that they confine the Divine Light to good Men, to the Regenerate, as to the Act of Illumination, tho not as to the Act of Possession. In short, All have it, but the regenerate only are actually enlightned by it.

Apology, P. 354.

Ibid.

I may urge this also as another Argument to prove that they do confine the Light as to the Act of Illumination to a certain number of Men, because (as every body knows that has had the least Conversation either with them or their Writings) they do confine it only to those that turn their Soul and Mind inwards

inwards unto it, (for till then, as the Preface to Mr. *Barclay's* Works says, *Man is Darkness*) at the same time supposing that not all, but a very few do so convert themselves unto it. Upon which double Supposition are grounded their so often repeated Admonitions and Exhortations to those they address their Writings or Discourses to, that they would turn their Souls inwards unto the Light, that they would mind, heed, follow it, and wait upon it in quietness and silence, &c. All which would be extremely ridiculous and impertinent, if either Men might be enlightned without converting themselves to the Light, or if it were certain and necessary that all Men should so convert themselves to it. Since therefore they do confine the Light as to the Act of Illumination to those that convert or introvert themselves to it, and at the same time do not make all Men to do so, it appears plainly that they do confine it to a certain number of Men.

Page 3.

And since again (as is well known) they look upon themselves as the only Professors and Embracers of the Truth of God, and the only Followers of the Light, and the only Converters of themselves to it, (which it seems is so much the proper Characteristic of a Quaker, that when any one is Proselyted to their way, 'tis ordinary for them to say, *Such an one is turn'd to the Light*) I think I had very good reason to say that they confined the Light to their own Party, meaning, (as plainly appears, and as I have often suggested) not as

to

to the Capacity or Possibility, nor as to the Act of Possession, but only as to the Act of Illumination. That tho other Men as well as themselves, yea, all Men have the same Light in them, yet *they* only see by it, and have actual Illumination from it, because they only turn themselves unto it, and (to express it in their more peculiar Phrase) are *Inward with it*. Wherein I think they differ again sufficiently from me, who am so far from confining the Divine Light in the least respect or degree, that I extend it as a common Benefit to all Men without Exception, yea, to all the Intelligent part of the Creation (which by the way I do not find they do, nor do I see how upon their Principle they can, since making it the Grace of Christ they must confine it to *Man*) and that not only as to the Act of Possession, but as to the Act of Illumination too, because I expresly say, that *they all see and understand in this Light of God, without which there would be neither Truth nor Understanding.*

Now to consider what Mr. *Vicars* alledges to the contrary: He says first of all, that it is a down-right Falsity that the Quakers do thus confine the Light. But let him prove this to be a Falsity as well as say it. He says again, that 'tis abundantly confuted by the Writings of the Quakers in general, particularly those of *Robert Barclay*. But I have made the contrary appear from those very Writings. But he says again, that they say all are actually enlightned by it, &c. To which I reply, That then they say Contradictions, and are in-

consistent with themselves. But he says again, that the Quakers have, and still do declare, that Christ Jesus the Light of the World is the Universal Free Gift of God, for the Benefit of all Men, in order to their Salvation. But by Mr. *Vickris* his leave this does not reach the Point in question, as proving the Universality of the Light only as to the *Capacity* of being enlightned by it, or as to the Act of *Possession* only, which I never supposed them to deny. But the Question is concerning the Universality of the Light as to the Act of *Illumination*, which is not at all proved by saying, that Christ Jesus the Light of the World is the Universal Free Gift of God, for the Benefit of all Men in order to their Salvation. But he further says, that my Distinction of a Possibility, and not Actually with respect to the Divine Illumination of this Principle, is trivial. But why so? May there not be a Capacity of being enlightned where there is no actual Illumination? Are not these distinct *Idea's*? And may not therefore one be without the other? But he says, the Capacity or Possibility is not, nor can be in Man abstract from the actual illuminating Power and Spirit, no more than seeing, if Light be not separate from the Eye. No? Why then do they so often divide the one from the other, in making all to be capable of Illumination by the Divine Light, when yet according to them all are not actually enlightned by it, nor any at all times? Of the Former, That all are not actually enlightned by it, I have already given an Account out of Mr. *Barclay*: And as to the Latter,

ter, That none are actually enlightned by it at all times, the ſame Author is ſo kind as to furniſh me with an Account in another place, where he gives this as a Reaſon why the Light is no Power or Natural Faculty of a Man's Mind, becauſe he cannot be actually enlightned by it at pleaſure, but muſt wait for the Irradiations of it. For, ſays he, *This Light, Seed, &c. appears to be no Power or Natural Faculty of Man's Mind, becauſe a Man that is in Health can, when he pleaſes, ſtir up, move and exerciſe the Faculties of his Soul. He is abſolute Maſter of them. But this Light and Seed of God in Man he cannot move and ſtir up when he pleaſes, but it moves, blows and ſtrives with Man as the Lord ſeeth meet. For tho there be a Poſſibility of Salvation to every man during the Day of his Viſitation, yet cannot a man at any time when he pleaſes ſtir up that Light and Grace, but he muſt wait for it, &c.* Bringing in the Compariſon the Lake of *Bethesda*, and the Angel at certain times moving upon the Waters. From which Words of Mr. *Barclay* it plainly appears, that no Man, tho never ſo cloſe a Follower of the Light, is under the actual Illumination of it at all times; and yet the ſame Author does not deny, but every where earneſtly contend, that the Light is always in Man as well as in every Man; and if this be not to abſtract the Capacity or Poſſibility from the Act of Illumination by the Light, I deſpair ever to know what is. And why may not the Capacity of Illumination be abſtracted from the Act, ſince they are not only in themſelves diſtinct, but proceed from different Cauſes, and

Apology, P. 338.

and between which there is (according to them) no necessary Connection. The former depending upon the *inshining* only of the Divine Light, and the latter upon the Soul's *Introversion* of it self to it, without which she will not be enlightned by that Light which she bears. According to what Mr. *Bradley* says upon that Text, *Rom.* 3. 11. *There is none that understandeth:* Why understand they not, but because they are not turn'd to the Light that can give them Understanding?

Truth clear'd of Calumnies, p. 8.

As to his Comparison taken from seeing, which he will not have possible to be abstracted, if Light be not separated from the Eye. I answer, First, That if there be any Force in it, 'tis against themselves, as convincing them of Absurdity in Abstracting or Dividing what is not to be divided. For the Signification of it must be this, That as the Act of Seeing is not to be abstracted from the Capacity when Light is not separated from the *Eye*; so the Act of Illumination is not to be abstracted from the Capacity of it, when the Divine Light is not separated from the *Soul*. And why then do they abstract the Act of Illumination from the Possibility, when they suppose the Divine Light to be present in the Soul; as 'tis plain they do when they teach, that 'tis not in the power of Man to be enlightned when he please, tho the Light be really in him? If the actual Illumination of the Soul must necessarily follow upon the Presence or Being of the Divine Light in it, then why do they abstract it from it, by supposing that Man

Man has it not always in his Power to move and ſtir up the Light, as was before noted? But indeed, whatever Connexion there may be between the Preſence of the Divine Light and the actual Illumination of the Soul, it does not follow that there is any from the Similitude he here uſes, in which there is no Force at all, the ground of it rightly conceived not being true. For *Seeing* may be either taken in a *Material* Senſe, for that Phyſical *Impreſſion* made upon the *Retina* by the Rays of Light that paſs in various Refractions through the ſeveral Humours of the Eye; or elſe in a *Formal* Senſe, for that *Senſation* of the Soul which ordinarily accompanies that Impreſſion, and whereby ſhe is conſcious of it. If Seeing be taken in the former Senſe, then indeed it will hardly be poſſible to abſtract the Act of Seeing from the Capacity of it, if the Light be not ſeparated from the Eye. But if Seeing be taken in the latter way, for the Senſation of the Soul, whereby ſhe is conſcious of that Phyſical Impreſſion made upon the Organs of Sight, (which is the moſt proper acceptation of the Word Seeing) then the Act of Seeing may very well, and is often abſtracted from the Capacity of it; and that notwithſtanding the Light be not ſeparated from the Eye. There being nothing more common than for Men, whoſe Minds are deeply fix'd upon ſome engaging Objects that call off and divert their Attention another way, not to obſerve what ſtands juſt before their Eyes, and what Phyſically and Materially ſpeaking they cannot chuſe but ſee. So that this Compariſon

as prettily as it looks, will not serve the purpose for which it is used. But I forget my self; 'tis pity a good Similitude should be spoil'd by being too nicely examin'd.

And now as to the Contradiction which he pretends to find between the Fourth Article, where all Men are supposed to be actually enlightned, and the Fifth, where the Light is supposed not Formally to enlighten me, but when I attend to it and consult it: Tho he has so lately spoil'd his Credit with me in this point, that I shall not be very forward to take his Word for a *Contradiction* again, yet I shall not scruple to confess, that there is at first View some Appearance of Opposition between these two, but I think no more than what any Fair and Candid Reader may easily accommodate, only by considering and collating together the two different occasions upon which these two seemingly opposite Passages were deliver'd. For in the Fourth Section, being to oppose my Notion against the Quakers as to the Confinement of the Light to certain Men, as to the Act of Illumination, there I lay down this Assertion, That *all Men are actually enlightned*. And in the Fifth Section, being to oppose my self against another Notion of the Quakers, in making the Light to be some determinate form'd Dictate or Proposition, expresly and positively directive and instructive; there I say, that it does not formally enlighten me but when I attend to it and consult it, as being no Form'd Proposition, but only the Essential Truth of God. Where-

in

in 'tis plain that I do not deny the actual Illumination of all, (the thing asserted in the former Section) but only determin the manner of it, that it is not done by any Proposition ready form'd and held forth to the Soul, but by the Soul's consulting the Divine Idea's, or Essential Truth of God. For when I say it enlightens Men only when they attend to it and consult it, I do not suppose that there are any that are not actually enlightned, but that those who are enlightned are enlightned *by attending*, supposing at the same time that all Men do in some measure attend to, and consult the Divine Light, so far at least, as is necessary to their common and ordinary way of Understanding, and to render them rational and intelligent Beings. 'Tis true indeed, the Quakers do also make the Light to enlighten none but those that convert themselves to it: But then there is this material Difference between us, that they representing the Light as an extraordinary Accession to the Order of Human Understanding, and as a Saving Grace in the whole Kind of it, do not suppose it necessary that all should turn themselves to it: Whereas I not looking upon it as an Extraordinary Grace as to the whole kind, but as an ordinary Requisite to Human Understanding, do suppose it necessary for all to turn to it, or consult it so far, as to render them thinking and understanding Beings. And so long as I make all Men in some measure to consult it, tho I do withal say, that they are enlightned by it only when they consult it, I do not thereby deny that all are actually enlightned

enlightned by it. For this does not deny the Universality of Actual Illumination, but only determins and specifies the way and manner of it. So that here is no Contradiction, but all things are Uniform and Consistent.

Exception against the Fifth Article.

THE Fifth I take in the First Part of it to be the same in Substance with thy First, differing in Form of Expressions, *viz. The Quakers by their Light within understand some Determinate Formed Dictate or Proposition expressly or positively directing or instructing them to do so or so*, as in thy first thou calledst it *some Divine Communication or Manifestation only*. Where didst thou learn this Definition of the Quakers Faith and Doctrin of the Light within? The Quakers believe the Light of Christ within to be God's Divine Oracle of Wisdom in the Soul, the Former, Dictator and Determiner of Heavenly Propositions, them directing and instructing what to chuse, and what to refuse, as the Original Cause of the Knowledg and Love of Truth, which are its proper Effects. Now wherein is the Quakers Light, as thou termst it, inferiour to that of thine, except in the differing Character thou givest it? They own the Real and Substantial Truth of God, the Life of the Word, the Light of Men, as Christ said of himself, *I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life*. That this Divine Light, which is the Light of Men, is always in some Degree and Measure present

in

in the Soul, by which it is upheld either in God's Love or Anger, the Quakers believe; and that in him we live, move, and have our Being, tho with respect to Operation after a different manner and measure, and passing the Understanding of Man. And whereas thou say'st, Thy Light is only the Essential Truth of God; This is an high Presumption, about which I have already shew'd thy Confusion in other places, calling it Reason and Conscience, and a Man's Natural and Ordinary way of Understanding. Consider *Mat.* 6. 22, 23. The Light of the Body, &c. *If therefore the Light that is in thee be Darkness*, &c. So may I say, if that Doctrin and Principle thou recommendest to the World for Truth and Excellency be erroneous and faulty, how great is that Error and Fault? Again, thou say'st, Thy Light is always present to thy Understanding, and intimately united with it still. *Sect.* 5. which in thy Sense of the Light is to say, thy Soul is never without thy Reason and Conscience. I wish they were both reform'd, that thou may'st be no more guilty of these and such like false Aspersions; That the Light, supposing it to be what really it is, a distinct Principle from the Soul, is always present to the Understanding, which implies its Operation upon the Natural Capacity or Organ, the ordinary means of knowing, I conceive is more than can be safely or experimentally said, because the Organ may be hurt, and the Understanding in that Sense interrupted, and consequently no fit Medium or Receptacle either for the Soul or its Light. Besides, the

Soul

Soul may be abſent from the Natural Underſtanding by the Interpoſition of Spiritual, as well as Natural Cauſes, and yet preſent with the Light in its Spiritual way of Underſtanding. But to ſay as thou doſt, that Thy Light is only the Eſſential Truth of God, and that it is always preſent to thy Underſtanding, and intimately united with it, and yet that it does not formally enlighten or inſtruct it, but when carefully attended to and conſulted, ſeems to diſcover a Contradiction in its ſelf, and to the Formal Reaſon of its Being, and Preſence, and Sufficiency in the one Act of the ſame Principle, as well as to the State and Nature of Intimate Union. For how can any thing be intimately united to its Principle, and not partake of its Nature and Influences, which is the Reaſon and Manner of its Union? And how can this be, and not carefully attended to and conſulted? Is not this manifeſt Confuſion? That the Preſence of the Light does enlighten and inſtruct all in ſome Senſe and Degree, is ſufficiently proved by Scripture. By thy Word Formally Enlighten I apprehend thou intendeſt the Operative Exerciſe, as in *Pag.* 17. and as here applied to Light, ſignifies no more than actually to enlighten, *ex parte Objecti.* I grant ſuch as do not carefully attend to and conſult this Divine Light, do not witneſs the Increaſes of it unto the Redemption and Salvation of their Souls.

It is the Path of the Juſt that is as the ſhining Light, that ſhineth more and more unto the perfect Day. If the Light, as thou aſſerteſt, doth

doth not formally enlighten or inſtruct, but when carefully attended to and conſulted how then ſhould it quicken and raiſe the Soul from Death to Life, according to the multiplied experience of Holy *David*? And how doth God ſpeak once, yea twice, yet Man perceiveth it not, *Job* 33. 14. 15, 16, 17. and *Iſa.* 65. How frequently doth the Lord complain by his Prophets of his calling to his People to return and repent, but they would not anſwer? Note, the Call of God is not without Inſtruction, read *Mic.* 6. 8, and *Prov.* 1, from 20, to the end. And ſee what Wiſdom does alſo in *Nehemiah*, how they rebelled againſt God, notwithſtanding he gave his good Spirit to inſtruct them. The Teſtimony of *John* the Evangeliſt, the 5*th* and 21*th*, *Epheſ.* 2. 1, 4, 5. 2 *Cor.* 4. 6, 7. Theſe and many other Texts, abundantly prove that God quickens and enlightens Man, before Man can turn unto him.

The Anſwer.

I Have given my ſelf the trouble to ſet down this Exception at large, not becauſe I intend to anſwer it all, but that it may appear to the Diſcerning Reader, that there is a great deal of it which I need not anſwer, as being either anſwer'd already, or ſo very impertinent and remote from the buſineſs, that it deſerves no conſideration. But in the firſt place, I cannot but admire at the ſingular Happineſs of his Fancy, in imagining the former part of

the

the Fifth Article to be the same in substance with the First, and to differ only in form of Expression. In the First it is said, that the Quakers usually talk of the Light within, as of some Divine Communication or Manifestation only; that is, as it has been explain'd, that they represent their Light, not as God himself, but only as a divine Communication, or as something communicated or exhibited by God. In the Fifth, it is said, That the Quakers by their Light within (that is, as Directive) understand some determinate formed Dictate or Proposition, expressly and positively directing and instructing them to do so or so: That is, that they make the Direction of the Light, or the Light as Directive, to consist in Dictates or Propositions ready form'd and presented to the view of the Soul, whereby she is formally taught and instructed. Now are these Two the same? If they are, so are a Square and a Circle. *Mr. Vicars* and my Self, Quakerism and Primitive Christianity. But he demands of me where I learnt this Account of the Quakers Faith and Doctrin of the Light within, *viz.* That they represent its direction by a determinate form'd Dictate or Proposition? I answer, from one that may be presumed to have dived into the bottom of Quakerism, and to have comprehended the whole Mystery of it, as well as any Man of that Profession, and that is Mr. *Barclay*, who speaking of that Letter of our Master that is writ in our Hearts, says, *Our Master is always with us, and he requires us to do all our Works by his immediate Counsel, Direction,*

Truth clear'd of Calumnies. p. 13.

rection, &c. And again to the same effect, speaking of the Jews rejecting Christ, notwithstanding that they had the Scriptures, he resolves it into this, *because they hearkned not unto the inward Voice and Testimony of the Father concerning him.* Again, he speaks of a Word in the Heart, and of the inward Testimony of the Spirit. Again, *He writes them a living Copy in their Hearts.* Again, he talks of *immediate Teaching* of the Spirit, and of *Preaching* that comes immediately from the Spirit. He says further, that this saving Spiritual Light, is the Gospel Preach'd in every Creature under Heaven. And that tho the outward Declaration of the Gospel be taken sometimes for the Gospel, yet it is but figuratively, and by a Metonymy. For to speak properly, (says he,) the Gospel is this inward Power and Life, which Preaches glad Tidings in the Hearts of all Men, &c. More expressly yet, Mr. *Barclay* calls the Revelation of the Light, the Voice of God inwardly speaking to the Mind of Man; and in this he makes the very form of Revelation to consist. And Mr. *Keith* makes the Divine Light to be all one with the Divine Voice and Call; and to this he applies that of the Twenty Ninth Psalm, *The Voice of the Lord is a Glorious Voice.* And to this purpose 'tis usual with them to apply that of the Prophet *Habakkuk*, *I will stand upon my Watch, and set me upon the Tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me*, Hab. 2. 1. And that of the Psalmist, *I will hear what God the Lord will Speak*, Psal. 85. 8. All which Passages do plainly enough

Ibid. p. 16. P. 17. P. 18. P. 28. *Apology*, p. 349. *Possibility and necessity of inward immediate Revelation*, p. 896. *Way to the City of God*, p. 163. P. 170.

imply, that they represent the Direction of the Light after the manner of a determinate form'd Dictate or Proposition formally and expresly tutouring and instructing them. And Mr. *Vickris* himself acknowledges as much in the Words immediately following his Question, when he says that the Quakers believe the Light of Christ within to be God's Divine Oracle of Wisdom in the Soul, the Former, Dictator and Determiner of Heavenly Propositions, them directing and instructing what to choose, and what to refuse. Which how it differs from my Account, that they make it a determinate form'd Dictate or Proposition expresly directing and instructing them to do so or so, I confess my Eye-sight too weak to distinguish. But if Mr. *Vickris* be as good at finding out *Differences*, as he is at finding out *Likenesses*, perhaps he may be able to distinguish them.

As to what he says concerning the Light's not always actually operating upon the Understanding, because the Organ of Perception may be sometimes indispoſed, he does not therein at all contradict me, who tho I make the Light to be common to all Men, even as to the act of Illumination in some degree or other, (enough to render and denominate them Rational Creatures,) yet am far enough from supposing with *Descartes*, that the Soul does at all times actually *think*. His Principle indeed obliges him so to suppose, because he makes actual Cogitation to be of the very Essence of the Soul, as much as Extension is of

of the Essence of Matter. But my Principle does not any way oblige me to the like supposition; nor do I suppose that the Soul is in every instant actually inlighten'd, or (in other words) that she does always actually *think*. 'Tis plain she does not, as in the case of Infants in the Womb, and of Maturer Persons when in a deep Sleep. Herein therefore Mr. *Vickris* does not at all contradict me, who agree with him as to this Point, that the Soul is not always in actual Illumination. But tho in this he does not contradict *me*, yet he very foully and grossly contradicts *himself*, in making at the same time the Presence of the Light to the Understanding, to *imply* its *Operation* upon it, when according to his Principles he must acknowledge the Light to be ever present with the Soul. And if always present, then according to him it must always operate, since the Presence implies the Operation, wherein he plainly contradicts himself. As he does again afterwards, when he taxes me of Contradiction and Inconsistency, in supposing the Light always present to my Understanding, and intimately united with it; and yet that it does not formally enlighten it, but when attended to and consulted. This he says, discovers a Contradiction in it self, and to the formal reason of its Being and Presence, and Sufficiency in the one act of the same Principle, as well as to the state and nature of Intimate Union. For how can any thing, says he, be intimately united to its Principle, and not partake of its Nature and Influences, which is the reason and manner of

its Union? In all which, he still proceeds upon his former Supposition, that the Presence and Union of the Divine Light with the Soul, does necessarily imply and infer its operation upon it. And since upon the Principles of Quakerism 'tis acknowledg'd, and by Mr. *Vickris* himself in this very exception openly confess'd, that the Light is always present; (for says he expresly, *that this Divine Light is always in some degree and measure present in the Soul, the Quakers believe*;) this plainly contradicts what he had laid down before, that the Light does not always operate upon the Understanding, and that to say that it does, is more than can safely be said. Why more than can safely be said, if the Divine Light be always present to the Soul; and if the Presence of the Light does necessarily infer its actual Operation? I may ask here of him in his own Words, *Is not this manifest Confusion*? Nay, is it not withal manifest Contradiction, and downright Inconsistency? If not, I will never pretend to judge of a Contradiction again.

As to the Contradiction, he would fain fasten upon me, because I suppose the Light always present, and yet not actually to inlighten but when attended, 'tis evident that it is of no force, unless I had held the same Principle with him, that the bare Presence of the Light does infer its actual Operation on the Soul; and then indeed I had been guilty of Contradiction, as he plainly is. But I do not acknowledge the truth of that Principle,

that

that the bare Presence of the Light does of it self inser its actual Operation, and that for the same reason he himself has provided ready to my Hands, viz. because the *Organ* of Perception may be *indisposed*. There must concur the Disposition of the Organ as well as the Presence of the Light. Among which Dispositions the most immediate is *Attention*, which I therefore make necessary to actual Illumination, not intending thereby to deny the Universality of actual Illumination, but only to specifie and determine the manner of it, supposing at the same time, that all Men do attend in some measure or other, tho not at all times, or in every instant of their Lives.

Now as to those Texts of Scripture he brings to prove that our Illumination is not by Attention, because the Grace of God prevents Man's tending to him, which I think is the sum of what he deduces in many Words. To this I return this double Answer, 1. That if there be any force in this Argument, it falls as heavy upon themselves as upon me, because (as is well known) they also make turning to the Light, which is the very same with my Attention, to be a necessary requisite to actual Illumination. 2. That there is no force in the Argument; for the word *Turning* here is equivocal, and may signifie either the Moral Conversion of the Will to Holiness and Righteousness, which is the fruit of true Illumination, or that Simple Conversion of the Understanding to the Light

of God, which is the cause of it. If the former, then I grant that the Grace of God does Inlighten Man, before Man can turn to him; that is, a Man is first Inlightned before he is Converted. But if the latter, I deny that God does Inlighten Man, before Man turns to him; nor do the Texts cited by him prove it. Man must first Convert himself to the Divine Light, and attend it, before he can be inlightned by it. For 'tis by Man's Attention to the Light, that the Light has any actual influence upon his Mind. Nor is this any derogation to the Grace of God, to say that Attention is on Man's part a prerequisite Condition to Illumination, because 'tis by the Grace of God that he is first moved and enabled to attend. For the work of Divine Grace does not (as Mr. *Vicars* seems to fancy) consist in this, in Inlightning Man without his Attending, but in ingaging and inclining him to Attend, which (as I acknowledge) I may without any derogation to the Grace of God say, that Man must Attend, before he can be Inlightned; or that without Attention, there is no Illumination. As suppose I should say, (what is commonly presumed as true in Moral Discourses,) that *Consideration is the Principle of Repentance*. I do not thereby either exclude or prejudice the Grace of God, because 'tis by the Motions of that, that the Man is brought to consider. And now I think I have answered all that is Material in this Fifth Exception.

Exception

Exception against the Sixth Article.

THy Sixth and last Section, I take to be an extravagant Noise and Bluster against the Quakers, to supply the want of real matter of Objection. What means else so great and general Reflections, without offering any proof, or reducing it to a particular Charge? To say the Quakers do not offer any rational or intelligible account of their Light within, proves nothing. To tell the World as thou dost, they Cant in some loose and general Expressions about the Light, does little else but impose upon truth, which is to beg Credit, whilst thou mentionest not what those loose and general Expressions are. But to say they confirm them by the Authority of St. *John*'s Gospel, is in some sort to contradict thy Assertion; for so to confirm them, argues they agree to what is there taught, *&c.* A

The Answer.

IN the Sixth and Last Article against which he now excepts, I had charged the Quakers with not offering any rational or intelligible account of their Light within, neither as to the *Thing*, nor as to the *Mode*, which I then thought, and do still, to be altogether unprincipled and unphilosophical. Now this he is pleased to call Noise and Bluster, and complains of it as a general Charge without

any Proof. 'Tis true, I did not prove it then, not becauſe I diſtruſted my ability to do ſo, but becauſe it would have ingaged me upon a Subject too large for my undertaking at that time; which was only to point out in ſhort thoſe principal Heads of Difference which diſtinguiſh'd my notion of the Divine Light within, from that of the Quakers. But ſince he is pleaſed to call upon me for a Proof of this now, I will be ſo civil as to give it him, tho I believe he will find occaſion by that time I have done, to wiſh he had never put me upon this Undertaking. For I doubt not but that I am able to make my Words good, by ſhewing the Quakers Notion of the Light to be indeed unprincipled and unphiloſophical. But becauſe this is a general Charge, and ſuch as concerns the intire Body of their *Hypotheſis* concerning the Light, I ſhall not do it here, but ſhall rather refer it to a particular Treatiſe by it ſelf, which I intend as an Appendix to this, under the Title of *The Groſſneſs of the Quakers Notion of the Light within, with their Confuſion and Inconſiſtency in explaining it*; which I ſuppoſe will be a full Anſwer to this laſt Exception. In which therefore I ſhall only further take notice for the preſent of a pleaſant fancy of our Author, in ſuppoſing that I make their Expreſſions about the Light, agreeable to what is taught in St. *John's* Goſpel, becauſe I ſay that they *confirm* them by that Authority. Whereas it is plain that I mean no more than that they alledge the authority of St. *John's* Goſpel for their Confirmation,

mation, which is the common ſenſe of the Word *Confirm*, as it is uſed by the beſt *Latin* and *Engliſh* Authors. If Mr. *Vickris* does not know this, he is very Ignorant; if he does, he is very light and trifling.

THE GROSSNESS OF THE Quaker's Principle OF THE Light within,

WITH THEIR

Inconsistency in Explaining it.

DISCOURS'D

In a Letter to a Friend.

By *JOHN NORRIS*, M. A. Rector of *Bemerton* near *Sarum*, and late Fellow of *All-Souls* College in *Oxford*.

If the Light that is in thee be Darkness, how great is that Darkness! Matth. 6. 23.

LONDON,

Printed for *Sam. Manship* at the *Black Bull* in *Cornhil*, near the *Royal Exchange*, 1692.

THE CROSSNESS OF THE Quaker's Principle OF THE Light within.

WITH THEIR Inconsistency in Explaining it.

DISCOURSED

By JOHN NORRIS, M. A. Rector of Bemerton near Sarum, and late Fellow of All-Souls College in Oxford.

LONDON, Printed for Sam. Manship at the Black Bull in Cornhill, near the Royal Exchange, 1704.

SIR,

WHAT you observe to me concerning the general Exultation and Triumph that is among the *Quakers* upon the late Publication of Mr. *Barclay's* Works in Folio, is what I can easily *believe*, and know not well how to *blame*. For I know of no Church or Society of Christians that is already so rich in Reputation for Great Men, but might well be proud of the Accession of so considerable a Writer, much more they who have hitherto been so barren in Productions of this kind, that in stead of having many *Intelligent* Writers, they have had but few that are so much as *Intelligible*. We may therefore well allow the Quakers to swell and plume a little, when they have at once so *Rare* and so *Great* an Occasion for it. For really, *Sir*, Mr. *Barclay* is a very great Man, and were it not for that common Prejudice that lies against him, as being a *Quaker*, would be as sure not to fail of that Character in the World, as any of the finest Wits this Age has produced.

But to qualify and allay their Joy, that they may not be overset with it, you suggest to me that it would be convenient if they were now a little taken down and humbled, to which I assent as a very proper and seasonable

Under-

Undertaking, and withal as now worthy of the greateſt of our Learned Pens. For I cannot forbear thinking *Quakeriſm* to be now conſiderable enough to deſerve an Oppoſition, and that if any of the Learned would with Credit and Reputation attempt the Confutation of it, now is their Time, now their looſe and ſcatter'd Notions are reduced to Order and Method, and appear under the Form of a Regular and Artificial Syſtem, with all the Advantages that can be given them from a Scholaſtical Head, and a well-order'd Education. Now therefore there would be ſome Adventure in the Engagement, and Honour in the Conqueſt.

And thus far, Sir, I agree with you, thinking an Undertaking of this kind to be as proper and ſeaſonable as any that the Juncture of the preſent Age can afford; I only diſſent from you in the Choice of the *Undertaker*, who I doubt is not ſo well qualify'd for ſuch a Work as you who are not ſo well acquainted with him as I, ſeem to imagin. However, ſince you are pleas'd to impoſe your Commands upon him, he is loath wholly to decline them even while he knows himſelf unable to perform them, but does ſo far prefer his Duty to his Reputation as to be willing to lead the way, and to flouriſh a little upon the Strings, in hopes that his aukward and inartificial touching of them may provoke ſome more *Maſterly* Hand to take up the Inſtrument.

By

By this, Sir, you may perceive that 'tis not my Design to examin the whole Body of Quakerism, which indeed would require more leisure and opportunity than the ordinary Business and particular Engagements of my Life will conveniently allow. I shall chuse rather to single out one of their most Capital and Fundamental Principles, and to expose the Grossness and Absurdity of it, and that is their Famous Doctrin of the *Light within*, which you know, Sir, to be the very Heart of their Cause, that Cardinal Point upon which the whole Weight of their System turns, the very Life and Soul of Quakerism.

I know very well, nor can you, I suppose, be ignorant, that this Principle of theirs, since its first appearance in the World, has been all along entertain'd with Laughter and Contempt; and tho by themselves the most regarded of any, (for there is no Point of theirs upon which they lay so much Stress as upon this) has yet by others been most of all Vilified and ridiculed, and has contributed the most of any one thing to that great and general Contempt they lie under, next to the particular Oddness of their Habit and Ayr, and the Uncourtliness of their Language and Behaviour.

Nor is there any thing either strange or amiss thus far. For certainly this Notion of the Light within, according as the Quakers explain and represent it, is really ridiculous enough to make the Patrons of it so, and

well

well deserves all the Scorn and Contempt that is cast upon it. But that which I particularly observe as blamable in this matter, is this, that the generality of those who deride the Doctrin of the Light within, know not upon what Grounds they do it; nay, for the most part, they do it upon no other Grounds, than barely to indulge the humersom Inclinations of a certain light and wanton Spirit that loves to dispairage and run down all novel and singular Opinions, especially if they carry in them an Ayr of Seriousness or Religion. And of those few that proceed by more certain Grounds and Measures of Judgment, the greatest part proceed by false and undue ones, condemning the Doctrin of the Light within not as 'tis held and represented by the *Quakers*, (for to my Knowledg very few even of the Learned have given themselves the Curiosity to know how they hold it) but in *Gross*, and in *General*. They condemn the Doctrin not as so or so stated, but in common, and as such, in its most direct and immediate Sense, thinking it absurd to suppose that there is any other Principle of Light in Man besides his Rational Soul, which they will have to be a Light to it self, at least as far as concerns Natural and Moral Truths.

Now herein I confess I am so far from agreeing with these Gentlemen of the Second Order (for the former are of no account) that I think they do very ill in deriding and ridiculing this Doctrin of the Light within in general and as such, and are guilty of more Impiety

and

and Profaneness than they are aware of. For upon the deepest Consideration of all the possible ways of Human Understanding I am thoroughly perswaded, (and have partly shewn the Grounds of this my Perswasion elsewhere) that Man cannot be his own Light, or a Light to himself in the acquirement of Knowledg, and therefore that there must of necessity be some other Principle of Light in him distinct from his own Rational Nature; which you know I make to be the *Divine Idea*, the Eternal Λόγος, or Substantial Word and Wisdom of God, in whom I suppose Man to perceive all that he perceives. I am therefore so far from disallowing or condemning the Doctrin of the Light within, that I very earnestly stand and contend for it, as for a very true, solid and necessary Notion; without which there can be no intelligible Account given of the Mode of Understanding. I am therefore so far from taxing the Quakers for the general Supposition they go upon, that I heartily joyn with them in it, supposing, as they do, that *Man cannot be a Light to himself*; only I adhere more closely to this Supposition than they do. For when they make Man uncapable of being a Light to himself, they mean, not as to *Natural* things, (which according to them may be discern'd by a Natural Light) but only as to *Spiritual* things, which cannot be discern'd but by an Higher Principle. Whereas I acknowledg the Supposition in a greater Latitude, supposing Man uncapable of being a Light to himself, not only with respect to Spiritual Truths, but even as to Natural things,

all which are discern'd by that one common Light of Man, the *Divine Light*, which I make to be necessary not only to the Discernment of Divine and Spiritual Truths, but even to the Natural and Ordinary Acts of Understanding.

I do not therefore find Fault with the Quakers for holding such a thing as the *Light within*; so far from that, that I very much outdo them in the Latitude of the Principle, as making it more necessary, and more extensive than they. I do not (as some do) disapprove of the Doctrin in general, but have a very convincing Assurance of it, and a very awful Regard and Veneration for it, as a very Noble and Sacred Theory. But that which I condemn in the Quakers as to this Point, is their particular manner of stating and explaining the general Notion of the *Light within*, which I think to be as Gross and Absurd, as the Notion it self in general is fine and rational. And that upon this double Account.

I. Because they make it to be a Creature.

II. Because they make it a Material Creature.

Upon which two Grounds I question not but that I shall be able so to demonstrate the Falsehood and Absurdity of this grand Article of Quakerism, as to render it utterly incapable of Defence, even tho Mr. *Barclay* himself were now alive to be my Opposer.

But

But because this is to be the Ground and Bottom of the following Discourse, and that I may not be thought to contend against a Suppositious Notion, or Imaginary Absurdity, I must take care in the first place, that this which is to be the Foundation of all, be well laid, by proving plainly and undeniably that the Quakers do represent their Light within after the manner already intimated, *viz.* As a *Creature*, and as a *Material Creature*, before I undertake to expose their Absurdity in so doing. In order to which I must give an Account of this Light within, and shew what it is according to the Quakers. Wherein I believe (so little have the Principles of Quakerism been enquired into, even by those that nevertheless take the liberty to laugh at them) I shall tell a great many even of the Learned World a considerable piece of News.

And here to reduce the matter to as narrow a Compass as may be, (there being nothing wherein I admire Brevity more than in *Quotations*) I shall be content to take my Account from two of their most eminent and approved Writers, Mr. *Barclay* and Mr. *Keith*; and to prevent all suspicion of Misrepresentation, shall deliver it in their own express Words. Thus then Mr. *Barclay*, speaking of the Universal and Saving Light of Christ, *By this Seed, Grace and Word of God, and Light wherewith we say every Man is enlightned, and hath a measure of it, which strives with them in Order to save them, and which may by the Stubbornness and* *Apology*, p. 333.

Wickedneſs of Man's Will be quenched, bruiſed, wounded, preſſed down, ſlain and crucified, we underſtand not the proper Eſſence and Nature of God preciſely taken; which is not diviſible into Parts and Meaſures, as being a moſt pure ſimple Being, void of all Compoſition or Diviſion, and therefore can neither be reſiſted, hurt, wounded, crucified or ſlain by all the Efforts and Strength of Men. But we underſtand a Spiritual, Heavenly, and Inviſible Principle, in which God, as Father, Son and Spirit dwells: A meaſure of which Divine and Glorious Life is in all Men as a Seed, which of its own Nature draws, invites and inclines to God. And this we call Vehiculum Dei, *or the Spiritual Body of Chriſt, the Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt, which came down from Heaven, of which all the Saints do feed, and are thereby nouriſh'd unto Eternal Life.*

From which Account of Mr. *Barclay* it is plain, 1. That they do not make their Light within to be *God*, (for he ſays they underſtand not by it the proper Eſſence and Nature of God) and conſequently muſt make it to be a *Creature*, there being no Medium between God and the Creature. 2. That they do alſo make it to be a *Material* Creature, ſince he ſuppoſes it diviſible into Meaſures and Portions, calls it *Vehiculum Dei*, and the Spiritual Body of Chriſt, and that Fleſh and Blood of his which came down from Heaven, and which is both Food and Nouriſhment to the Saints. None of which Affections can with any tolerable Congruity agree to a Spiritual Subſtance, ſtrictly ſo call'd. Again, ſays Mr. *Barclay*,

Barclay, discourſing of the Communion or Participation of the Body and Blood of Chriſt, *The Body then of Chriſt which Believers partake of, is Spiritual, and not Carnal, and his Blood which they drink of is pure and Heavenly, and not Human or Elementary. If it be aſked, what that Body, what that Fleſh and Blood is? I anſwer, it is that Heavenly Seed, that Divine, Spiritual, Celeſtial Subſtance of which we ſpake before in the 5th and 6th Propoſitions*; (the place juſt before quoted) *This is that* Vehiculum Dei, *or Spiritual Body of Chriſt, whereby and wherethrough he communicateth Life to Men, and Salvation to as many as believe in him, and receive him, and whereby alſo Man comes to have Fellowſhip and Communion with God.* Again, ſays he, *That this Body and Spiritual Fleſh and Blood of Chriſt is to be underſtood of that Divine and Heavenly Seed before ſpoken of by us, appears both by the Nature and Fruits of it.* And again, *That Chriſt underſtands the ſame thing here by his Body, Fleſh and Blood which is underſtood,* John 1. *By the Light enlightning every Man, appears,* &c. Again, *As Jeſus Chriſt did by the Eternal Spirit offer up that Body,* (meaning his Carnal Body) *for a Propitiation for the Remiſſion of Sins, ſo hath he likewiſe poured forth into the Hearts of all Men a meaſure of that Divine Light and Seed wherewith he is cloathed,* &c. I ſhall quote but one Paſſage more from Mr. *Barclay* to this purpoſe, and 'tis in his laſt Diſcourſe concerning the Poſſibility and Neceſſity of inward Immediate Revelation, where having diſtinguiſh'd between Natural and Supernatural Ideas, he ſays, *As the Natural Ideas*

Apology, p. 494.

Page 495.

Ibid.

are stir'd up in us by outward and natural Bodies; so those Divine and Supernatural Ideas are stir'd up in us by a certain Principle, which is a Body to Naturals, in relation to the Spiritual World, and therefore may be call'd a Divine Body. Not as if it were a part of God, who is a most pure Spirit; but the Organ or Instrument of God, by which he worketh in us, and stirreth up in us these Ideas of Divine things. This is that Flesh and Blood of Christ, by which the Saints are
Page 901. *nourish'd, which is a Mystery to all unregenerated and meer natural men, &c.*

Here we meet with a Continuation of the same Notion. For as in the former Instances he made the Light to be all one with the Spiritual Body of Christ, and again reciprocally the Spiritual Body of Christ to be the self-same thing with the Light, so now supposing our Spiritual Ideas to be raised by a Divine Body, he makes this Divine Body to be no other than that Flesh and Blood of Christ by which the Saints are nourish'd, and which he had before made all one with the Light, and consequently he makes the Light to be a Divine Body. For if the Light be the same with that Flesh and Blood of Christ by which the Saints are nourish'd; and if that Flesh and Blood be a Divine Body, then 'tis plain that the Light is also a Divine Body.

So much at present for Mr. *Barclay*. Now
Page 64. let Mr. *Kieth* take his turn, who in his Way to the City of God, speaking of the Divine Seed (which they always make one and the same

same with the Light) says, That *it is call'd oft in Scripture the Body of Christ, and his Flesh and Blood, which the Soul feeding upon becomes cloath'd therewith, as with a Body, and thereby dwelleth in Christ, and liveth in him, as the Branch in the Vine.* Again, *The Saints feel it* (namely the Divine Seed or Light) *in them as really to be a Part or Particle of the very Substance of Heaven*, viz. *Of that Spiritual and invisible Heaven where the Saints live, as they do feel the Body of their outward Man to be a Part or Particle of the Substance of this outward World.* Again he says, that this Divine Seed (or Light) *is not the Godhead it self, but a certain middle Nature, Substance or Being, betwixt the Godhead and Mankind*, &c. *This will be thought the more strange* (says he) *by many, because they have been commonly taught, and have commonly received it, that there is no middle Substance betwixt the Godhead and us, at least as to the inward: For they have supposed that the Spirit or Mind of a Man or an Angel is next unto the Godhead, which I deny; for the Heavenly or Divine Substance or Essence of which the Divine Birth was both conceiv'd in* Mary, *and is inwardly conceiv'd in the Saints, is of a middle Nature.* Ibid. Page 130.

And left by their Calling (as they often do) this Substance a Divine Substance, they should be thought to imply that it was the very Substance of God, he takes care to lay in a Caution against any such Construction in the next Paragraph. *This middle Nature* (says he) *I call a Divine Substance or Essence, not as if it were* Ibid.

the Godhead it self, or a Particle or Portion of it, but because of its Excellency above all other things next unto the Godhead; as on such an Account Men do call other things Divine which are very excellent; yea, some call Holy Men Divine, and some call these who teach the things of God, Divines, as John, *who wrote the Revelations, is call'd* John the Divine. *Also this excellent and intermediate Being may be call'd the Divine Being, because the Godhead is most immediately manifest therein, and dwelleth in it as in the most Holy Place, or Holy of Holies.*

He further tells us, speaking of the Conception of the Virgin *Mary*, that God did
Page 129. *really sow a most Divine and Heavenly Seed in the Virgins Womb*, and that by Vertue of this
Page 132. *Christ had a Divine Perfection and Vertue, and that Substantial, above all other Men.* Again,
Page 133. he says, that *his Body hath not only the Perfections of our Body, but also much more, because of its being generate not only of the Seed of* Mary, *but of a Divine Seed, and that this Divine Seed*
Ibid. *is that Universal Balsom or Medicin to cure and restore not only all Mankind, but also the whole*
Page 134. *outward Creation: That this is the Little Leaven that shall Leaven the whole Lump of this visible Creation, whereby all things shall be made new,*
Ibid. &c. That this is that *Stone of the Wise Men, which by its Touch shall in due time change, not only the Bodies of the Saints, but the Body of the whole Creation, and purge it from all its Weak-*
Ibid. *ness and Impurity. For* (says he) *what can perfectly cure and restore the Sick and Diseased Body of Nature either in Man, or in other things, but his*

his incorruptible Body? &c. All which Expreſſions do plainly intimate, that this Divine Seed whereof Chriſt was generated, and we are regenerated, (for according to them, that which was the Principle of Chriſt's Natural Birth, is the Principle of our Spiritual Birth) was really a material corporeal Subſtance; and ſince the Light is by them ſuppoſed to be all one with this Divine Seed, it is very evident that they make the Light to be alſo a material corporeal Principle. The ſhort of this matter lies in this Form of Argument.

The Divine Seed whereof Chriſt was naturally generated, and whereby we are regenerated is a Body.

But the Light within is one and the ſame thing with this Divine Seed.

Therefore the Light within is a Body.

And this do theſe two great Pillars of Quakeriſm Mr. *Barclay* and Mr. *Keith* agree with each other, and both of them in this, in making the Light within not to be God or a Subſtance properly Divine, but to be a Creature, and more than that, to be a Material and Corporeal Creature.

But that the Reader may have yet a more full Account, and more clear and exact Comprehenſion of this matter, I will take their Hypotheſis from the very Ground and Bottom of it, and reſolve it into certain diſtinct Principles

ciples or Suppoſitions, which (as far as I am able to gather from the forecited and other like Paſſages that occur up and down in their Writings) are ſuch as theſe.

1. They ſuppoſe that the Spiritual Life, or the Life of Holineſs and Grace, is a Subſtantial Life, even as the Life of Vegetation, the Life of Senſation, and the Life of Reaſon are all Subſtantial.

2. They ſuppoſe that this Subſtantial Life is by the Vital Union of the Soul with ſome Body or other.

3. They ſuppoſe that this Body in the Vital Union of the Soul with which Spiritual Life does conſiſt, is a certain *Divine* or *Celeſtial* Body, even as the Natural Life does conſiſt in the Vital Union of the Soul, with a *Natural* or *Terreſtrial* Body of the common Elementary conſiſtence.

4. They ſuppoſe that Chriſt had Two Bodies of a diſtinct Original, and of a different contexture, a Carnal Body, and a Spiritual Body, a Body which he took from the Virgin *Mary*, and a Body in which his Soul exiſted long before he took Fleſh of the Virgin. They are the very Words of Mr. *Barclay*, which becauſe they are of particular concernment, I will ſet down at large. To the Queſtion of his Adverſary, Had Chriſt Two Bodies? He anſwers, *Yes*; *and let him deny it if he dare, without contradicting the Scripture,*

Apology Vindicated, p. 861.

Scripture, Joh. 6. 38. *Christ speaks of his Flesh which came down from Heaven; but this was not the Flesh he took from the Virgin* Mary, *for that came not down from Heaven; but he had a Spiritual Body, in which his Soul existed long before he took Flesh of the Virgin.* Which I think is an expreſs Declaration for a Two-fold Body of Chriſt, the Body wherein he was Incarnate, and a Body antecedent to his Incarnation.

5. They ſuppoſe that this latter, the Spiritual Body of Chriſt, is that Divine or Celeſtial Body in the Vital Union of the Soul, with which our Spiritual Life, or our Life of Grace does conſiſt; that this is properly that Seed of God mention'd by St. *Peter* and St. *John*, which was ſown in the Womb of the Virgin, and in the Hearts of Mankind, that whereby Chriſt was naturally generated, and whereby the Saints are regenerated, that this is that Heavenly Manna, that Living Bread diſcours'd of in the Sixth of St. *John*, that Divine Aliment upon which the Saints do feed, and whereby they are nouriſh'd unto everlaſting Life.

6. And Laſtly, they do alſo ſuppoſe that this Spiritual Body of Chriſt wherein his Human Soul exiſted before his Incarnation, a meaſure whereof is given as a Divine Seed to every Man to Leven, Seaſon and Sanctifie his Nature, and by cloſing and uniting with which our Nature becomes actually Sanctified, that this I ſay is that very *Divine Light* which God

God has set up as a Monitor, Instructer and Teacher in the Hearts of Men, to guide and direct them in the way of Salvation: That this Spiritual Body of Christ, is what they suppose to be the Light of Mankind, I need appeal to no other Evidence than the latter part of the first Quotation out of Mr. *Barclay*, where he says that they understand by the Light, *a Spiritual, Heavenly and Invincible Principle, in which God as Father Son and Spirit dwells, a measure of which Divine and Glorious Life is in all Men as a Seed, which of its own nature draws, invites and inclines to God. And this we call* (observe) Vehiculum Dei, *or the Spiritual Body of Christ, the Flesh and Blood of Christ which came down from Heaven, of which all the Saints do Feed, and are thereby nourished unto Eternal Life.* By which I think it is plain as far as Mens meanings may be gather'd from their Words, that they make the Light within to be the Spiritual Body of Christ, or a certain measure or Portion of that Body.

And thus having according to the best of my Understanding and Observation given an Extract of the Quakers Principle concerning the Light within, (which I have so well consider'd both before and after the framing it, that I can with good assurance stand by it, and dare appeal to all the Learned of that way, whether I have not given a true and just account of their Principle.) I now hasten to the Second part of my Undertaking, to expose the Grosness and Absurdity of it.

And

And here in the first place, I shall be so free and ingenuous, as to declare that I shall not stand with them concerning any of the Five First Propositions, which may be all true for ought I know to the contrary. Particularly I shall not stand with them concerning the *Spiritual Body* of Christ, as distinct from that Natural Body, wherein he was incarnate of the Virgin *Mary*: There may be such a thing for ought I know, or am able to shew to the contrary, and I know that several among the *Antients* have been of this Opinion, alledging for its Foundation the Sixth Chapter of St. *John*, which to confess the truth, seems to favour it not a little. And this Hypothesis has been of late to the great surprize and amusement of the stiffer and severer sort of Divines, readvanc'd by a Person of singular note and eminence in our Church, who makes use of it to salve and maintain the Doctrin of the *Real Presence*, supposing that while the Bodies of the Communicants feed upon the grosser Elements of Bread and Wine, their Souls (as many of them as are fitly disposed) do take in and feed upon this Divine and Spiritual Body of Christ, which strengthens and nourishes their *Inner Man*, and becomes to them a Principle of Regeneration and Spiritual Life, as you may see more fully deduc'd in his Discourse of the Real Presence, particularly in the First and Sixth Chapters of that Treatise.

I shall not therefore, I say, contend with them concerning the Spiritual Body of Christ, either as to its Existence, or as to this its use, whether there be such a thing, or whether it be the Principle of Regeneration and Spiritual Life to the Saints: They may be both true for ought I know, I see nothing absurd or so much as improbable in them; and as I do not surrender up my full Assent to what I cannot demonstrate to be *True*, so neither do I care to run down and condemn such Principles which I cannot prove to be *false*. But that which I dislike and condemn here, is their making this Spiritual Body of Christ to be the *Light within*, that Light which is to teach Man Wisdom and Knowledge, and to be his constant Tutor, Monitor and Director; which notion of the Light within (notwithstanding that I highly approve of the thing it self) I take to be extreamly gross and absurd, and that upon those Two Accounts before touch'd upon.

1. Because hereby they make it to be a Creature.

2. Because they make it a Material Creature.

That they do make the Light to be a Creature, and a Material Creature, is sufficiently shewn already, in the account that I have given of their notion concerning it. I am now only to lay open the absurdity of this.

And

And First, 'Tis absurd to make the Light within to be a *Creature*. Monsieur *Malebranche* considering with himself of all the possible ways whereby we may come to have the Ideas of things without us, makes this Division or Enumeration of them. *It is necessary* (says he) *that these Ideas should either proceed from the Objects, or that our Mind has a power of producing them; or that God should produce them, either with the Mind when he Creates it, or occasionally, as often as we think of any Object. Or that the Mind should possess in it self all the Perfections which it sees in things. Or else lastly, that it be united to some Absolutely Perfect Being, that includes in himself all the Perfections of Created Beings.* And these are all the possible ways of Human Understanding that this excellent Theorist could conceive, or thought conceivable. But this 'tis to have a dull Invention, and a straitness of Imagination, that is not open enough to let in a full view of things. We now meet with a sort of Philosophers of a freer Prospect, and more inlarged Survey, that have found out another mode of furnishing the Mind with Ideas, and that is, by its being united to some *Created Being*, and that too a *Material* one. Strange, that so inquisitive and so working a Head as that of M. *Malebranche* should be so defective in his Enumeration, as not to hit upon this most wonderful Expedient of uniting the Soul to a *Creature*, in order to its Illumination! But sure he could not overlook it, but rather thought it too inconsiderable to be mention'd. 'Twas no doubt very easie and obvious for him

De inquirend. Veritat. p. 198.

to

to have consider'd, that the last Member of his Distribution might have been divided into Two, only by making his Supposition run first in general, *that the Mind be united to some Being or other*, and then by distinguishing that general into *Created* or *Increated*. This I say he might easily have done, and in point of exact order and Method, perhaps should have done; but not dreaming that any would ever be so extravagantly gross, as to resolve the Illumination of the Mind into its union with any *Creature*, and not in the least questioning but that if Men were once come so far into the right path, as to make the Illumination of the Mind to depend upon its Union with some Being or other, they would have no further scruple upon them whether this Being were God or no, he chose rather to pass over all union with the Creature in Silence, and to make this his last and only further supposable way of inlightning the Mind, *that it be united to some absolutely perfect Being that includes in himself all the Perfections of Created Beings.* Which no doubt is the only Basis upon which an Intelligible Hypothesis of Human Understanding can ever be raised. And I cannot but greatly wonder that those who come up so very near it, should yet upon a suddain turn off, and pass it by.

The *Quakers* seem with M. *Malebranche* to disclaim and renounce the Four First of the ways propoſed, and they agree with him so far in the Fifth and last, as to resolve the Illumination of the Soul into its Union with some

ſome Being or other. But herein they divide and take ſeveral ways, in that M. *Malebranche*, makes this Being to be *God*, who is abſolutely Perfect and all-comprehenſive, eminently and vertually all, and the *Quakers* will needs have it to be a *Created* Being. Which Hypotheſis I think to be very Abſurd.

1. As needleſs.

2. As impoſſible.

1. *It is a needleſs Hypotheſis*: For if the Soul of Man be not ſufficient to be a Light to it ſelf, but its Illumination muſt be reſolv'd into its union with ſome other Being (which theſe Men implicitly grant when they reſolve it into its Union with a *Created* Being,) then what Being ſo fit and proper for this purpoſe as God, who by reaſon of the Immenſity and Spirituality of his Nature, muſt needs be intimately preſent to all Minds, and by reaſon of the Infinity of his Eſſential Perfection, muſt needs have in himſelf after an eminent and intelligible manner, all the Degrees of Being, and conſequently the Ideas of all things? If there be a Being ſo qualified, certainly our Illumination muſt be reſolv'd into our Union with that Being: And if there be a God, then there muſt be a Being ſo qualified. And therefore it muſt be from our Union with him that all our Light and Knowledge is derived, who would of himſelf ſufficiently inlighten Man, not only without

the *Conjunction*, but even without the *Coexistence* of any other Creature.

For I would demand of these Men that contend for a Created Light, an Answer to this one Question: Suppose God should annihilate all the whole Creation except one Intelligent Spirit, so that there should be nothing in being but that single Spirit and Himself, would this Spirit upon the removal of all his Fellow Creatures out of being, cease to understand or no? I know upon their Principle they must say that he would, as supposing his capacity of Knowledge to depend upon his Union with a certain Created Being, *viz.* the *Spiritual Body of Christ*: But setting aside their Principle, (which is the thing under Question, and therefore must not be used as a Medium to prove another thing by,) I see no reason in the nature of the thing it self, why they should say that such a Spirit would in such a Supposition cease to understand; and I think there is all the reason in the World to suppose he would not, as being still notwithstanding this great and Universal Emptiness, united most intimately to a Being of Absolute and Infinite Perfection, and that contains in himself the Ideas of all things. Certainly this great and Universal *Representative* would be a sufficient Light to that *Solitary* Spirit, who would not want Thoughts or Ideas, tho he might want a Companion to Communicate them to. And therefore tho the Notion were otherwise never so possible and consistent, yet it is altogether needless to seek out for Union with

with any Creature, in order to that Illumination, which conſidering the Omnipreſence and All-perfection of God, muſt needs be ſuppoſed, tho there were no other Creature beſides one Intelligent Spirit in being. But as this is needleſs, ſo

2. *It is alſo an impoſſible Hypotheſis*: It is abſolutely impoſſible, that a Creature ſhould be a Light to Man, or that one Creature ſhould be a Light to another. God is the great *Luminary* of the whole Intellectual World, and 'tis he only that can be a Light either to the Soul of Man, or to any other Intelligent Being. No Creature, tho never ſo glorious and excellent, not even the Human Soul of Jeſus Chriſt, (much leſs his Spiritual Body,) can ever be a Light to the Mind of Man. For to be a Light to the Mind, is to be to it the Principle of Underſtanding, to furniſh it with *Ideas*, and to be the formal and immediate Object of its Conception. And for this there are Two Conditions neceſſarily required, Firſt, That it be intimately preſent and united to the Mind. Secondly, That it have the whole Perfection of Being, ſo as to have the Ideas of all things, and to be an Univerſal Repreſentative. Which Conditions, (eſpecially the laſt,) no Creature either has, or can poſſibly have: And therefore no Creature is able to be a Light to the Soul of Man.

Were a Creature never ſo excellent, yet it would be of a finite Perfection, and conſe-

quently of such a certain determinate order, rank, kind or species; that is, it would be such a particular *degree* of Being. It would not be all Being, or Being at large, (for then it would be God,) but only such a definite and determinate degree of it. And consequently were it never so intimately united to my Mind, it could be able to represent only it self, and such degrees of being as were in it self. That is, it might represent it self and all that is of the same kind with it self, but it could not represent any thing else, for it could not represent more degrees of Being than it had. It could not therefore represent any Creature of another Order from it self, as a *Sun* suppose could not represent a *Tree*, nor a *Triangle* a *Circle*, since each of these have degrees of Being that are not in the other, and consequently cannot be represented by the other. For this is a most undoubted Principle, that nothing can represent any more degrees of Being than it has. Suppose your Creature therefore of never so raised and excellent an Order, it would be able to represent only it self, and those of the same Species. And what a poor account would this turn to! What a dim *Wooing* Light would this be for a Rational Soul to see by!

And as such a Created Light would represent but little of the Creation, so it would not be able to represent God at all, whom we are chiefly concern'd to know, if 'twere only that we might be ascertain'd of the Truth of other things, the certainty of which (as

Descartes

Descartes has well obſerv'd and proved, depends upon our knowledge of God. But now it is impoſſible that God ſhould be repreſented to our Minds by a Created Light; for as there muſt be at leaſt as much Reality in the Object, either formally or eminently, as there is of Objective Reality in the Idea, (which is one of the Principles upon which M. *Deſcartes* grounds the exiſtence of God,) So 'tis as true on the other Hand, that there muſt be as much Reality in the Idea, as there is formally or eminently in the Object, or elſe that Idea will never be able to repreſent that Object, and that by vertue of the Principle before laid down, That nothing can repreſent any more degrees of Being than it has. But now God does infinitely ſurpaſs the whole Order of the Creatures, exceeding the higheſt degrees of them by a whole Infinity, and therefore cannot poſſibly be repreſented by any or all of them. God indeed may repreſent a Creature to my Mind, as having all the degrees of Being in that Creature, and infinitely more, but a Creature can never repreſent God, as having no manner of Proportion to his Excellency. For if (as it has been ſhewn,) one Creature cannot repreſent another, that has but one degree of Being beyond it, or which the other has not, as a Triangle cannot repreſent a Quadrangle, as having one Angle more than it ſelf, much leſs can a Creature be a Repreſentative of God, of whom it falls ſhort by no leſs a meaſure than a whole Infinity. Take an Extract of all Created Perfection, and you will never be

able to raiſe an Idea of God out of it; for to add Creature to Creature, is but to add finite to finite; and as that will never *make*, ſo neither will it be ever able to *repreſent* an Infinite. So much impoſſibility is there in the notion of a *Created Light*, which can repreſent but little of the Creature, and God not at all. And ſo very Abſurd are thoſe that ſtand for it, ſince the end for which they mainly deſign it, and ſuppoſe it to be afforded to Man, is to conduct him to God, of whom it ſeems it cannot give him ſo much as an Idea.

And now if it be ſo Abſurd to make the Light within to be a Creature, then how much more Abſurd is it to ſuppoſe it a *Material* Creature? *Aquinas* I remember propoſes it as a Queſtion, Whether one Angel may not Illuminate another: But among the many trifling and frivolous Queſtions which he puts, I think he never thought it worth his while to inquire, whether a Clod of Earth, or a Sun-Beam (if you pleaſe) could illuminate an Angel? He that thought an Inferior Angel could not illuminate an Angel of a Superior Order, to be ſure did not imagin that it could ever enter into any conſidering Head, that Matter ſhould be able to illuminate Spirit. And I cannot but ſtand amazed at the Extravagancy of their Imagination who think it can. Sure the wild diſorders of a Fever, can hardly produce a more odd phantaſtical conceit than this. It has been thought a ſtrange adventure in Speculation, to ſuppoſe, that Matter

Prim. Part. Quæſt. 106. *Art.* 1.

Ibid. Art. 3.

Matter by the advantage of a finer Mechaniſm, ſhould be made capable of *Thought*, and be able to reaſon and underſtand; and the truth is, I would give a great deal to ſee the *Mould* in which thoſe Mens Heads were caſt, who could entertain ſuch a Notion. But alas, what is this in compariſon of making Matter the *Principle* of *Illumination*! 'Tis groſs enough of any ſenſe to ſuppoſe Matter capable of thinking it ſelf, but to ſuppoſe it to be an Intellectual Light, to be a Principle of thinking, to make it a Maſter and Inſtructor, a Furniſher of Thoughts and Ideas, what an Extravagance muſt this be! What, Matter illuminate Spirit! How harſhly it ſounds! How it grates upon a Philoſophical Ear! For beſides that ſuch a Suppoſition as this would invert and confound the whole Order of things, by exalting Matter above Spirit (which according to this muſt depend upon Matter for the nobleſt of its Operations, that very Operation whereby it is diſtinguiſh'd from ✱, and ſuppoſed to be placed above it,) I ſay beſides this, how is it poſſible that Matter ſhould be a Principle of Illumination to the Soul? For in the firſt place, how ſhall we ſuppoſe it capable of being intimately united and preſent to it? Or if we could conceive this to be poſſible, yet what would it be able to repreſent? It would be able to repreſent nothing but what is Material, and but a little of that neither, even no more than thoſe few degrees of Material Perfection it ſelf is ſuppoſed to have; it could repreſent nothing Immaterial or Intellectual. For its

Ideas could be no other than certain Material Images or Figurations; and a Material Idea can never represent an Immaterial Object. A Principle so very clear and certain, that even those who derive our Ideas from Sensible Objects, supposing them to be Corporeal Emanations, do yet find it necessary to look out for an Expedient, whereby they may be refined and Spiritualized after their admission into the *common Sensory*, namely by the help of what they call *Intellectus Agens*, whose Office they say is to purifie and refine these Material Phantasms, and to render them Immaterial, that so they may become Intelligible. A very hard Task task for poor *Intellectus Agens*, and were he not a Creature of their own Brain, it would move any ones Pity to think what a piece of Drudgery he is Condemn'd to. But that puts an end to our concern; for so he that reads the many severe toils and hardships of a poor Romantick Adventurer, feels a secret warmth about his Heart, and is apt ever now and then out of a tenderness of Spirit to dissolve into a passion for the Noble Sufferer, till as he is just about to drop a Tear, he remembers that 'tis but a *Romance*, and then all is well again. But by the way, this is a most miserable Device, and such as sufficiently betrays the absurdity and nullity of their *Hypothesis*. For hereby they plainly acknowledge the truth of this Principle, that a Material Idea cannot represent an Immaterial Object, (for otherwise, what necessity of having it Spiritualized,) and if so, then since their Ideas are Material, the whole weight of their Hypothesis

pothesis rests upon this single Bottom; *The Transmutability of Material into Immaterial Ideas*, which if found to be impossible, their Hypothesis can no longer stand. Now I must needs confess it does as much surpass my Understanding, how a Material Idea can be transform'd into an Immaterial one, as how a Material Idea can represent an Immaterial Object. They are alike Mysteries to me, and I doubt not but that they are both alike Absurdities in themselves.

Well then, the Sum of the matter in hand will come to this: If the Ideas of a Material Principle must be also Material, and if a material Idea cannot represent an Immaterial Object, then 'twill follow, that a Material Light will not be able to give the Soul a Representation of any thing that is Immaterial or Intellectual. And if so, what little stead will it serve us in! The greatest part of our Notions are Intellectual. We cannot speak or write three or four Words, but some of them will stand for Ideas that represent Intellectual Objects. There is no thinking nor conversing, tho never so little, without this. And what shall we do then with a Light that is not able to furnish us with Ideas for a quarter of the things we are concerned both to think and to discourse of? So utterly unserviceable and insufficient is a Material Light for the purposes of Human Understanding, and so senseless and absurd is the Notion that Asserts it. The Sum of what has been hitherto discours'd

turns

mens all within the Compaſs of this Syllogiſm.

That Notion which makes the Light within to be a Creature, and a material Creature, is Abſurd.

But the Notion of the Quakers concerning the Light within makes it to be ſo.

Therefore the Notion of the Quakers concerning the Light within is Abſurd.

The Firſt of theſe Propoſitions is what we have been proving now laſt of all. The Second was proved in the Account given of the Quakers Principle of the Light. The Concluſion therefore follows, That the Quakers Principle of the Light within is Abſurd. Which was the Propoſition I undertook to prove, and I am very much miſtaken in my Accounts if it be not well proved.

And thus having repreſented the Groſſneſs of the Quakers Principle of the Light, I will now in the Concluſion add a Word or two concerning their Inconſiſtency in explaining it. That Perſon may well be eſteemed Inconſiſtent with himſelf, who ſo explains his Hypotheſis in the Particulars of it, as to contradict that general Ground upon which it is built. But now this I take to be the Fault of the Quakers in relation to the Point in Hand. The general Ground upon which they build their Hypotheſis of the Light within is this,

That

That Man cannot be a Light to himſelf, (for if he could, what need there be another Principle of Light within him) and does therefore require ſome other Principle of Illumination for his Conduct and Direction. This is the Principle they go upon, and ſo far I think they are right enough. But now when they come to give a particular Account of their Hypotheſis, they ſo order the matter as to contradict and give up again that General Principle. For if that Light within, which is to be the Principle of Human Underſtanding be a *Creature*, then Man might as well have been his own Light, or a Light to himſelf, that is, he might arrive to the knowledg of things, by conſulting the Perfections of his own Nature, the only Reaſon why Man cannot be a Light to himſelf being this, becauſe no Creature can be ſo. But if a Creature may be a Light, and the Light within be a Creature, then why may not Man himſelf be that Creature; and then what need of any ſuch thing as a Light within diſtinct from the Rational Nature of Man, which would be to renounce their general Principle, and to fall in with the Vulgar Hypotheſis of Human Underſtanding. So that this is a Notion altogether inconſiſtent with it ſelf, as well as diſagreeable to Truth.

I have now finiſh'd what I undertook, and, if I miſtake not, fully anſwer'd the Title of this Treatiſe. If any ſhould think it ſtrange that I would be ſo far diverted from better Studies, as to ſpend time and pains in diſproving the Principles of ſo inconſiderable a Perſwaſion

ſwaſion as that of the *Quakers*, I muſt in anſwer to this take the Liberty to tell them,

1. That (*as to better Studies*) I know nothing that does better deſerve the Conſideration of a Rational Creature, than the Mode and Way of Human Underſtanding.

2. That (as to the Inconſiderableneſs of the Perſwaſion) I cannot think Quakeriſm to be ſo, as the Principles of it are laid down and managed by Mr. *Barclay*. That Great and General Contempt they lie under, does not hinder me from thinking the Sect of the Quakers to be by far the moſt conſiderable of any that divide from us, in caſe the Quakeriſm that is generally held be the ſame with that which Mr. *Barclay* has deliver'd to the World for ſuch; whom I take to be ſo great a Man, that I profeſs to you freely, I had rather engage againſt an Hundred *Bellarmins*, *Hardings*, or *Stapyltons*, than with one *Barclay*.

However, as great a Man as he is, I think I have given his Principle of the Light a clear and thorough Confutation, and have likewiſe therein ſufficiently anſwer'd my *particular Adverſary*, who perhaps by this time may have reaſon to repent that ever he ſet me to work. I know, Sir, very well, that 'tis one thing to anſwer the *Book*, and another thing to anſwer the *Man*: For ſome Men will never be anſwered, tho their Books are. But I am not ambitious of the *laſt Word*, becauſe I know wiſe Men do not uſe to judg of the iſſue of a Diſpute

pute by that Measure. Mr. *Vickris* therefore may have *that* if he please, and the rather, because I think it will be all he is like to get by his Engagement with

SIR,

Your Humble Servant,

J. N.

POST-

POSTSCRIPT.

SIR,

THERE is one very material Consideration relating to the Impossibility of the Hypothesis of a Created Light, which happen'd to escape my Thoughts till I was past the place where it ought naturally to have come in, and therefore I must set it down here by it self. You know, Sir, a very great Part of our Study and Thinking, as well as of our Familiar Discourse and Conversation, is employ'd about *Necessary* and *Eternal Truths*. And most of our Arts and Sciences are Conversant about them, as being indeed the Principal Object of Human Knowledg. And therefore it is necessary, that that which is to serve us as an Intellectual Light should be able to represent these things to our Minds, whatever else be left unrepresented. But now this is what a Created Light will never be able to do, there being nothing in a Created Light that is able to answer or bear any Correspondence to that which is Necessary and Eternal. For a Creature is a *Contingent* Being, all the Reality that is in it is wholly Contingent; and as Contingency can never represent Necessity or Eternity, so neither can that which is Contingent represent what is Necessary or Eternal.

This

This I confeſs is a very Metaphyſical Argument, and ſuch as will require a great deal of Abſtraction and Attention in him that will be Maſter of it. But if attentively weigh'd and conſider'd, I believe it will be found to amount to no leſs than a *Demonſtration*.

FINIS.

Books Printed for, and Sold by Sam. Manship *at the* Black Bull *in* Cornhil.

A Collection of Miſcellanies, conſiſting of Poems, Eſſays, Diſcourſes and Letters. The Second Edition, with Amendments. Price Bound 4 *s.*

Theory and Regulation of Love, a Moral Eſſay, in Two Parts. To which are added, Letters Philoſophical and Moral, between the Author and Dr. *More*. In 8°. Price 2 *s.*

Reaſon and Religion, or the Grounds and Meaſures of Devotion, conſider'd from the Nature of God and the Nature of Man, in ſeveral Contemplations; with Exerciſes of Devotions applied to every Contemplation. In 8°. Price 2 *s.*

Reflections on the Conduct of Human Life, with Reference to the Study of Learning and Knowledg. In a Letter to the Excellent Lady the Lady *Maſham*. To which is annexed a Viſitation Sermon, by the ſame Author. The Second Edition with large Additions. Price Bound 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

Chriſtian Bleſſedneſs, or Diſcourſes upon the Beatitudes of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt. The Second Edition. In large 8°. Price Bound 3 *s.*

The charge of Schiſm continued, being a Juſtification of the Author of the Chriſtian Bleſſedneſs, for his charging the Separatiſts with Schiſm, notwithſtanding the Toleration. In a Letter to a City Friend. In 12°. Price 1 *s.*

Practical Diſcourſes upon ſeveral Divine Subjects. In large 8°. Price 3 *s.* All theſe Seven Written by the Reverend Mr. *John Norris*, M. A.